BX
801
E17

AMERICAN
ECCLESIASTICAL
REVIEW.

(MONTHLY)

VOL. III.] EDITED BY REV. H. J. HEUSER. [NO. 4.

Professor of Exegesis and Introd. to S. Script., Theol. Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

"*Ut Ecclesia ædificationem accipiat.*"
I. Cor. xiv. 5.

OCTOBER.

1890.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,

NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

SUBSCRIPTION, FOR THE UNITED STATES and CANADA, $3.50 per annum.
EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, $4.00. AUSTRALIA, $4.50

Literary Communications and Books for Review to be addressed to the Editor;
Business matters and Subscriptions, to the Publishers.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., for transmission through the mails at Second-Class Rates.

Adprobatio.

Ephemerides Catholicas studio theologicarum disciplinarum promovendo, rebusque ecclesiasticis explicandis atque tuendis addictas, quæque hunc titulum præseferunt, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, vehementer probamus cleroque commendamus.

J. CARD. GIBBONS,

Arch. Balt.

BALTIMORÆ,

die 22 *Junii*, 1889.

Imprimatur.

MICHAEL A. CORRIGAN,

Arch. Neo-Ebor.

NEO-EBORACI, *die m. Sept.* 25, 1890.

Imprimatur.

PATRITIVS JOANNES RYAN,

Archiep. Philadelph.

PHILADELPHIÆ, *die m. Jan.* 1, 1890.

H. GABRIELS, S. T. D.,

Censor Deputatus.

RECOMMENDATION.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA:
Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1889.

Messrs. FR. PUSTET & Co.

Gentlemen: By all means enroll me as subscriber to the REVIEW from its first number. So excellent a periodical deserves the hearty encouragement of all ecclesiastics.

Yours in Christ, JOHN J. KEANE.

AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. III.—OCTOBER, 1890.—NO. 4.

THE JEW JOSEPHUS AS A WITNESS TO CHRIST.

HISTORICAL evidence is of immense importance for the defence of the Christian religion in our day. They tell of a schoolmaster in Holland, where the house-tops are gable fashioned, that one day, while he was explaining to the children the Scripture history of how the prophet walked on the roof at noon-time, a precocious boy asked aloud how it was possible to walk on the roof. The teacher, who had never been beyond the limits of his native land and knew nothing of the flat roofs of the East, finding himself puzzled, answered severely: Nothing is impossible to God! The story has a moral. If the assertion of authority ends the matter for some, it awakens suspicion in others. In an age of general scepticism, such as the present, the existence of the supernatural is not to be taken for granted. It must be proved. We may not convince a man by the best of arguments, but we must be able to adduce sufficient reasons to establish just motives of credibility. And in the matter of furnishing such motives we cannot have recourse to simple abstract truths. Tell an educated man, who has no religion because he does not realize the existence of the supernatural, that the desire of the human heart towards complete happi-

ness must have its complement in the actual existence of perfect happiness; or that the idea of God in the mind proves a corresponding reality outside of it, and you may find that the argument carries not a particle of weight with him, unless it be to weaken your position in his eyes for want of a better proof. But confront him with facts which he cannot deny or is disposed to accept, as he would accept them under ordinary circumstances, when there is question of assuring himself of the truth of a theory, and he will listen, and probably examine. Now, the Christian religion bears the test of examination, not only from within and for those who, already Catholic in heart, simply seek the confirmation of their Christian instincts in the teachings of the Church, but likewise for those who approach it from without, with no predisposition in its favor. To such, the testimony of the non-Catholic historians is of great importance, the more so when these are above the suspicion of partiality in favor of Christianity.

Let us say we meet with a sceptic in religion, who is otherwise intelligent and sincere in acting from honest motives. He may disbelieve in the existence of God, or in the supernatural character of Christianity, or in the authority of the Catholic Church as the only legitimate continuation of the power and mission of Christ. In answer to his doubts we refer to the fact that Christ is not a myth but a reality; that He taught the most sublime truths and attested His mission as a divine teacher by many miracles, and that His familiar friends, eye-witnesses of His daily life and actions for three years, record these facts with a simplicity of statement which bears no trace of enthusiasm, but breathes thorough conviction. Among the truths thus taught, confirmed by miracles and written down by faithful and sincere witnesses, are those which the sceptic questions, viz.: the existence of God, the supernatural character of the Christian religion, and the rightful authority of the Church such as it was established by Christ. The cardinal point at which we come and to

which we return under all circumstances is: Was Christ such as He is represented in the Gospels? If not, then He was an impostor or an insane fanatic, for there is no alternative between the two suppositions, since we know that He died for the assertion of His divine mission. The idea of blind fanaticism can hardly be sustained by any reasonable person, because there is first of all an utter absence of all fanatical activity in His life as recorded, which breathes essentially the spirit of prudence, forbearance, and a love of peace. In the second place, the plea of the Jews upon which they demanded His execution would not have availed in the Roman courts, if Pilate had been convinced of the fact that it was simply a question of quelling pious enthusiasm; for he expressly denies any other charge, such as that of sedition, which had been alleged, and places the cause of the clamor against Christ in the hatred of the Pharisees.—But you object that the testimony of the Gospels is open to suspicion of partiality. Very well. There were other historians besides the Evangelists who speak of Christ. And as the Christian teaching was hateful alike to Jew and Gentile, we may trust their words and presume that, if these statements of the Evangelists were a lie, it was the interest of those who proscribed the so-called infamous novelty to point out the falsehood and the imposition, the more so, as the Nazarene was dead and had died in ignominy, and his humble followers claimed such extraordinary things for Him and defied the learning and authority of the Hebrew, Greek, and Roman philosophers.

It must be supposed from the very nature of things that such testimony is scant. But whatever there is, it should in the logic of ordinary events have been rather against the Christian claim than for it. One of the witnesses frequently adduced by Christian apologists for the purpose of establishing the character of the Founder of the Christian Church, by the purely historical testimony of adversaries, is Joseph Ben Matthia, or, as he calls himself, *Flavius Josephus.*

Before we enter upon the value which the testimony of this man possesses from a critical point of view, since its authenticity has been disputed, let us briefly examine the character of the one among Jewish historians most competent to judge of the person of Christ, both on account of the time in which he lived, and owing to the position of impartiality which we must accord him.

Born of a mother who traced her descent to the noble race of the Machabees, Josephus united in himself brilliant talent and an ardent admiration for the prerogatives and sacred destinies of his people. At the age of sixteen he had passed through the schools of the Pharisees, Saducees, and Essenes. Three years he remained an adherent of the latter sect, but their retiring and contemplative habits seem to have but partially accorded with the naturally ambitious disposition of the youth, who was destined soon to become a military leader. He subsequently joined the Pharisees, his former teachers. At the age of twenty-six he went to Rome in behalf of some Jewish prisoners belonging to the priestly cast. Nero was Emperor at the time, and the Roman officials were exercised alternately by seditious movements among the Jews, who hoped to rid themselves of the Gentile yoke, and by the increase of the Christians, who under the teaching of the Apostles and their new mode of life began more and more to throw into disrepute the pagan worship and concentrate upon themselves the odium of its defenders. It is difficult to suppose that Josephus, who was deeply interested in the release of his brother Jews, failed to come in contact with St. Paul, who was also captive at this time in Rome, and had drawn public attention upon himself by his preaching and wonderful deeds during the journey thither. The Romans made no distinction between the Jews and the Christians, the latter of whom they regarded as an inferior sect of the Hebrew people. When Josephus returned to Palestine he had learned enough of the political situation to know that the struggle of the Jews against the Romans would be a hope-

less one. He dissuaded the leaders from organizing the revolution, but seeing that he could get no hearing, and that he was beginning to be suspected of Romanizing tendencies, he assumed command and himself organized an attack. The Revolution in Galilee (Nov. 66) succeeded, and this placed him at once at the head of affairs in that province. Subsequent events showed that he did not intend to go on headlong in the way which the momentary enthusiasm of his people pointed out. He had made bitter enemies for himself, but by skilful diplomacy evaded their designs and maintained his position at the head of an army until Vespasian cut off all exit for them from the stronghold of Jotapata. Seeing the people obstinate in their resistance, and willing to die, Josephus by a strategy escapes their anger and places himself at the mercy of the Roman commanders. His natural gifts, his knowledge of the country, and his skill as a soldier made him a valuable aid to Titus during the later phases of the Jewish war. He allows indeed that he deserted his people in a useless struggle, but protests his reverence for the old faith and traditions. At the siege of Jerusalem he is said to have saved many lives and the copy of the Sacred Text which was preserved in the Temple. The last part of his life was spent in the pursuit of studies and the writing of several valuable works on the history of the Jewish War, Hebrew Antiquities, an apology of the Jewish race against Apion, an Ægyptian sophist, and an autobiographical defence of his policy as governor of Galilee. Other writings are attributed to him, but with doubtful propriety.

He wrote all his works in Greek, with the exception of the book on the Jewish War, which was originally written in Hebrew. Of the Greek manuscript copies of these writings none go back further than the tenth century. But we have several well known translations into Latin made by Rufinus (370) and others, vouched for as original by all the tests of severe criticism, and duplicated by contemporary and later writers.

The avowed object for which Josephus wrote his famous "Antiquities" was a defence of his race before the world, and intended particularly for the Romans, who were at that time his magnificent benefactors. He mentions all the important incidents and personages of the Jewish people, and when he comes to the insurrection of the latter against Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, we expect him, in the natural order of events, to speak of Christ. But we would also expect Josephus to discredit the pretensions of one who had openly claimed to be the Messiah: first, because he was in feeling a Pharisee; secondly, because it was his policy to please the Romans, for whom he wrote and in whose service he lived. That he sympathized with the religion of the Pharisees is evident from the manner in which he speaks of them and their practices and from the interpretation he gives to the sacred text of the Old Testament in many places. And whilst there are passages in his works which point out a rationalistic tendency, the impression remains that he was deeply imbued with the spirit of the sect to which he belonged. But the Pharisees had hated Christ, had condemned Him to death, and avowed that the new doctrine meant the subversion of the old. Again, the Romans held the Christians in utter contempt. Their philosophers despised and misrepresented the teaching of Christ in the most shameless manner. Josephus had been a witness to the barbarous persecutions of Nero, who slaughtered them like beasts by thousands. Could Josephus forget that the people who had been but lately branded as the incendiaries of imperial Rome were unpopular, and that to revile their Founder and Chief would be the only thing that might please the ambitious rulers and the proud upper classes of the eternal city? He had always been a thorough politician, and success ever waited his door. By speaking favorably of the Christians he now ran the risk of not only making himself unpopular, but of appearing inconsistent. If, nevertheless, he had resolved to be true and impartial, it was at least his policy to

touch upon those facts which must be odious to the many as briefly as possible. This he did. We can excuse him for it. To omit the name of Christ altogether was impossible. To speak of Him otherwise than he did, would have been untrue and unworthy of the historian.

The Passage in question reads in the translation [1] as follows:

Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. (And) he drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was (the) Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned Him to the cross, those who loved Him from the first did not forsake Him; for he appeared to them again living on the third day; as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning Him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from Him, are not extinct at this day.

This translation corresponds entirely with the Greek text, except that for the word "Gentiles" the term *Hellenists* is used in the original, and the expression "He was the Christ" is made more emphatic by the insertion of the word *legomenos* before *outos*.

Not before the sixteenth century do we find any one dispute the genuineness of the passage. Since then some commentators have declared it as altogether an interpolation introduced by Eusebius.[2] Among these may be mentioned Lefebre (Tanaquillus), and of a later date principally the German representatives of the rationalistic tendency in theology. Others have adduced the passage as a proof that Josephus was at heart a Christian. If this be true, he seems to have lacked the courage of his convictions. Among

[1] Antiquities of the Jews, Book XVIII, chap. iii., sect. 3, in Whiston's translation, entitled "Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, the learned and authentic historian," etc., vol. iv.

[2] It is utterly misleading when the *Encyclopædia Brittanica*, following a chosen authority, says that at the present time the weight of criticism is against the authenticity of the passage.

Catholic and orthodox Protestant Christians of acknowledged eminence and impartial judgment we have many, perhaps the bulk of writers, such as Mayand, Danko, Hettinger, Alzog, Hergenrother, pronounce for the authenticity. A third class of critics distinguish, and think that the passage may have been in part interpolated, but must be considered as substantially genuine. Among these we have the learned Villoison of the last century, and of latest date, Gustave A. Mueller.[1] Let us examine the reasons brought forth on either side.

ARGUMENTS.

Those who maintain that the passage is a spurious interpolation defend the assertion principally on the ground that Josephus, a Jew, and a pronounced friend of the sect of Pharisees, could not have spoken thus of Christ without inconsistency. They argue further, that it could only serve to give offence to the Romans, and whilst it was easy for him to pass over the mention of Christ altogether, it was utterly in conflict with his policy to speak of Him in praise, much more so to express his belief in Him as the Messiah.

This is the mainstay of the argument which discredits the entire passage, and we have already alluded to it as a plausible motive for not speaking favorably of Christ. But it will be noticed that the argument rests entirely on intrinsic evidence. We might answer it by a similar argument and say: But how could he avoid speaking of Christ, one way or another? He mentions St. John the Baptist in the very same book and speaks of him as a holy man,[2] who lead the people to virtue. Yet St. John had antagonized the Pharisees no less than Christ, and he had constantly pointed to the latter as One Whom the people should follow and the latch of Whose shoe he was not worthy to loosen. Further

[1] Christus bei Josephus Flavius. Eine kritische Untersuchung als Beitrag zur Lœsung der beruehmten Frage, etc. Innsbruck, 1890.

[2] Antiqu., XVIII., iii., 5, op. cit.

on Josephus mentions the unjust condemnation and martyrdom of St. James, whom he styles the brother (relative) of Jesus called the Christ, as if the latter were a person of greater note than St. James, who was venerated by the populace as a holy man, and for that reason was hated by the Pharisees. Was it at all likely that the historian of these times would say nothing of the wonderful man whom the people had known everywhere throughout Palestine and beyond its confines, and to whose disciples the same historian refers? No one has, to our knowledge, contested the genuineness of these latter passages, and they are unequivocally eulogistic. But let us see what extrinsic arguments there are, all of which seem to favor the contrary opinion.

1. Every known manuscript of Josephus's works, without exception, contains the passage. The various copies which we have of the original go back to the eleventh century. They must all have been falsified, or all must have been made from one falsified original. Moreover, we must in that case assume that there existed no copy in the possession of any Jew or Gentile which did escape the interpolation. This is absurd on the surface, since the work was written mainly for the latter class.

2. All the translations contain the passage. These are preserved as far back as the fourth century. But Eusebius (born about 270) expressly appeals to this passage as a testimony in favor of Christ, which he seems to have taken from some other writer before him, for Origen (born 185), in his work against the Platonist Celsus, speaks of the view of Josephus concerning Christ. Origen says, indeed, that Josephus did "*not* believe in Jesus *as the Christ*;" but we can readily understand how this might be true, without injuring the force of the argument. There are many able minds who accept the proofs of Christianity as conclusive, yet for one reason or other do not give the consent of their will, so as to become members of the true faith. In any case, Origen's statement seems to prove that Josephus men-

tioned Christ in such a way as to allow the inference that he did not follow his tenets. We need not suppose that Josephus wished to make a profession of the Christian faith, but simply to record a fact which, in spite of popular prejudice, seemed to himself to carry the weight of truth. We have the same in the case of such contemporaries and friends of his as Agrippa and Felix, who were afraid to believe. The objection, therefore, that Josephus could not consistently have mentioned Christ without condemning Him falls to the ground, since he did mention Him and yet nowhere in condemnation.

Besides these, many others of the early Fathers and historians appeal to the passage in question without seeming to doubt its authenticity. Such are Zozomenus, Isidor of Pelusium, Jerome, Ambrose, and Cassiodorus.[1]

We leave the reader to draw his own conclusion. Müller, the latest critic, attempts with much show of learning to prove that a portion of the text only is genuine, and that the reference to the resurrection and prophecies of the old Testament was introduced by some Christian copyist (perhaps by way of marginal note), during the time that lapses between the death of Origen, 253, and the writing of Eusebius, some fifty years later. But he leaves the clause asserting that Christ was the Messiah intact. This would be quite sufficient for the Christian apologist, for it gives us the testimony of one for several reasons naturally opposed to Christianity, at the same time a man of great erudition, in a position which gave him every opportunity of defending himself had he wished to sin by partiality on the opposite side. His testimony as historical evidence is contemporary with the writings of the New Testament, which had been only partly transcribed at that time.

[1] Cf. Hettinger: *Fundamental Theol.*, § 30, II.

THE SODALITY OF CHRISTIAN MOTHERS IN OUR PARISHES.

IT is said that King Darius once put the question to some learned men of his household, What is most powerful in this world? One answered: Wine. Another said: The King. The Jewish prince Zorobabel replied: Women, and above them the truth. As a reward for the wisdom of this answer he obtained the privilege of rebuilding the temple for his people at Jerusalem.

When some forty years ago the bishops of France took unanimous action in establishing congregations of Christian Mothers in all their parishes, they had realized the truth of the above-mentioned saying and felt that the sole hope of restoring the Church of St. Louis to her ancient beauty lay in "woman, and above her the truth." Napoleon had but half understood this when he said: Give me mothers, and I will bring back greatness to France. He could have succeeded only with the aid of truth to direct and control the mothers. "Sapiens mulier ædificat domum suam, insipiens exstructam quoque destruet." If we look for the immediate cause of social, moral, and physical degradation among the young, we find it mainly in the neglect on the part of the mothers. Few among men who have had a thoroughly good mother, go permanently astray and are lost to the world or to heaven. But on the other hand, few men whose mothers have lived below the moral level can boast of those prerogatives which secure social and domestic happiness, sound faculties of mind and body, and a disposition to industry and virtue. Some vices as well as virtues are hereditary. Statistics of foundling asylums and orphanages prove with an overwhelming show of fact that predispositions towards immorality and intemperance, and an inclination towards brutality, deceit, jealousy, theft, and like vices are transmitted by parents to their children. This disposition

is developed in proportion as the child remains under the influence of a vicious mother, whose constant example is like poisonous food, which the unfortunate offspring will be unable afterwards to expel from the system. Nevertheless nature intends the mother to educate her child in the first instance. No one else has the same power over it, as no one else ordinarily has in a like degree the disposition to make the child her sole object of care during the first years of its life. Without a mother's education there remains a void in the child. It has been recognized that the features of orphan children in large institutions, no matter how well they are cared for, show a lack of some quality which other children have. It may be that the absence of that trustfulness which a mother's care for her offspring naturally begets in the latter is thus written on the face of the orphan. The same must be said of their character, their moral sense. The sympathy of a mother, which the child misses during the time of its early helplessness, cannot be wholly supplied by the care of a matron or by the devotion of religious, whose love for the individual is directed not by maternal instinct, but by duty, and who must extend their care to many. This want of a love which apparently absorbs all other affections for the time being, leaves a corresponding void in the heart of the child.

However, our difficulties in training the young to a life of virtue, to habits of industry, cleanliness, and fidelity to their religious, domestic, and civil duties, do not come from orphan children. Self-sacrificing religious have given their care and lives to the task of directing these in a way which we could never supply, and whose successes God alone scores where men pass by, not noticing the labor or the results.

But that which most embarrasses and weighs upon a pastor's soul is the number of children in city and town who are still under the care of their own mothers. Where we have Catholic schools they are frequented by the children of the poor, whose habits of life and associations expose them more

or less to temptations of a grosser sort, and dispose them to the neglect of that conventional decorum upon which the public lay so much stress. We cannot reconcile it with our religious principles to refuse admittance to a child into the classrooms of the parochial school, because he is vicious, or dirty, or both. The civil law gives a weapon of self-defence to the public school in this regard, but we cannot accept such protection, since our object is first and foremost to reform and train the children that are most neglected. Surely, this alone would make the parish schools an absolute necessity for us, even if we had to pay thrice over the cost of maintaining them. But even where we have such schools, well equipped and attended, it is often impossible, certainly extremely difficult, to counteract the habitual home-associations of many children by the work done for them in the school. This can only be accomplished successfully by establishing, as it were, a school for the training of the mothers, simultaneously with the education which we give to their children.

For this purpose associations of Christian Mothers have been formed, as we said before, and exist at present in nearly every parish of Catholic France, in many large cities of Germany, Switzerland, and to a considerable extent in America.[1] By means of these unions many mothers together with their offspring have been saved, and the pastoral responsibility is considerably lightened. To appreciate fully the manifold benefits of such a union acting in conjunction with and under the direction of the pastor, or of a capable sub-

[1] The Sodality of Christian Mothers was first established at Lille (France) in 1850. Pius IX gave to it the title of an archconfraternity in 1856, and endowed it with special privileges in order to facilitate its spread. At present the centre for France, to which other societies of the same kind are affiliated, is in Paris. A similar archconfraternity exists for Germany in the city of Ratisbon. In the United States the Capuchin Fathers at Pittsburg obtained by brief of Leo XIII, dated January 16, 1881, the privilege of erecting the Union of Christian Mothers, established in the Church of St. Augustine of that city some years previously, into an archconfraternity. This centre for the United States counts at present 107 affiliated societies throughout the Union. The Holy Father has on several occasions since its canonical erection enriched this confraternity with special indulgences and privileges.

stitute, we should have to consider in detail the work that may be done by the members of the confraternity. This work embraces the treatment of the child in its first infancy. The mother, no matter what her own habits may be, can be influenced to abstain from injuring her child not only in a certain care regarding its moral well-being, but also that which is too often the foundation of evil habits, namely, the indiscriminate giving of food and drink. Many a habitual drunkard owes the almost inconquerable passion of his life to the folly of mothers who give stimulants to their infants in case of sickness. Next comes the period of first conscious impressions intervening between infancy and school life. Much can be done for the child at this time by the suggestions of the priest to instil the sense of reverence, gratitude, prayer, so that even the weakness and folly of older persons impress the child with a horror for sin rather than invite imitation of what is wrong. The controlling of the child as regards its frequenting school and performing the tasks assigned by the teacher is a natural consequence of the constant intercourse which exists between the priest or teacher and the mothers of the parish. Admission to First Holy Communion and to Confirmation will be easily regulated instead of giving rise to trouble and misunderstanding, as is often the case where the mother is guided in her estimate of a child's capacity by the maternal instinct alone, and not by a reasonable forecast of its future and permanent well-being, indicated by the judgment of the priest and teacher. There are many things, too, which the boy and the girl must be taught to keep them from shipwreck in later life, and which only a mother can teach them. And this is especially the case when they come to the time of maturity, and the die is cast for a life's happiness or woe in the proper choice of a companion for marriage. The priest can speak with more security and freedom to the mother than to the youth or maiden on subjects delicate to all, but most so to the anointed of the Lord. And beyond this, the observance

of the laws of the Church, the furthering of any good work in the parish, does it not almost always and mainly depend on the mother in each family? Thus they are a stronghold, perhaps the greatest stronghold, of the faith where once it has been planted.

Nor can we forget that there is another reason why this important portion of our flock requires separate and special attention. Our instructions and sermons are in the main confined to the more solemn services and the late Mass on Sundays and feasts. Those who have charge of the household, above all among the poor, owing to their domestic duties, are obliged to go to an early Mass and to be absent from the instructions given at other times. Thus they are defrauded by the necessity of their position from the little light that would guide them in the difficult work of educating their children in so far as we must expect it from them. Very much more might be said to draw out into strong relief the great need and advantage of an association in which the priest may reach the mothers of his flock directly and interest them in his and their most important work.

THE PROPER METHOD

of doing this readily suggests itself. We speak to our people on the duties of the parent, particularly the mother. We call together a few of the more intelligent mothers at an hour when they can be free, perhaps Sunday after Vespers, so as to allow them time to return to their household duties before the evening meal. We propose to them to unite for the purpose of mutually aiding each other in promoting the spiritual and temporal welfare of their children. The means suggested for the purpose will be prayer, approach to the sacraments at stated times, and instructions given them by the pastor or read to them by the teacher or some one competent among their own number. It may be well to add here that the devotions as well as the instructions should be short. There is ample material in books on the subject,

particularly such as are written by Ventura, Dupanloup, Muller, O'Reilly, Huguet, Cramer, Sickinger.[1] On the whole it may be said that such books are more useful when the priest makes them in part his own, and thus adapts them to the capacity and local circumstances of his congregation. A short, familiar conference on the successive phases of maternal duty takes a deeper hold on the audience than the reading of a book, especially when it is a translation from some foreign language. The reading of the lives of the saints, or a portion of one, selected for the purpose by the priest, would form a useful and interesting feature of these meetings. An altar in the church should be set apart for the devotions; for this is not only a rule of the confraternity, but serves the good purpose of stimulating a healthy attachment to the church and co-operation in its work. As the confraternity of Christian mothers is under the especial patronage of "Our Mother of Sorrows," an altar of the Bl. Virgin is the most appropriate around which to gather the members. Of course, their devotion, both as to time and place, should not conflict with other confraternities.

When a nucleus of Christian mothers, who understand the proposed work and are willing to co-operate in its furtherance, has been secured, statutes are drawn up embodying the general constitutions of the confraternity and such local adaptations as may suggest themselves to the pastor or priest who acts as the spiritual director of the union. These statutes must be submitted to the ordinary of the diocese for approbation. When the latter has been obtained in writing, application is made to the Archconfraternity for affiliation, by which act the members become participants

[1] The two last mentioned are especially intended for the use of Christian mothers: —*The Christian Mother.* The Education of her Children and her Prayer. By Rt. Rev. Cramer.—*A Sure Way to a Happy Marriage.* A Book of Instruction for those Bethrothed and for Married People. By Rev. C. Sickinger.—Also *Mother-Love.* A Manual for Christian Mothers. With an instruction on the Archconfraternity of Christian Mothers. By a Priest of the Capuchin Order. J. Schæfer, 60 Barclay Str., New York.

in the indulgences and other privileges accorded to all such confraternities of Christian mothers as have been canonically erected. It is probably the wiser policy, not to proclaim at once a general invitation to the union throughout the parish, but to select such mothers only as give promise by their zeal and exemplary conduct of efficient co-operation. When the society has once obtained a good name, and every member acts out faithfully the duties imposed, there will be less danger of stragglers throwing a dampening effect upon the whole work. Whilst it would be desirable to have every mother in the parish belong to the confraternity, it should be understood that admission to the union is an honor and requires exactness in the fulfilment of the duties which each member freely takes upon herself for her own and the mutual benefit.

We shall explain in our next article the statutes of the confraternity, the obligations in detail of its members, and the privileges attached to the union, together with the authentic documents which have reference to the same.

HYPNOTISM AND THEOLOGY.

1. *Hypnotism. By Albert Moll (Berlin).—Scribner and Welford.* 1890.

2. *La Vérité sur l'hypnotisme. A. Lelong. (Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne. Oct.* 1889.—*Maj.* 1890).

3. *Psychology as a natural science applied to the solution of occult psychic phenomena. By C. G. Raue, M. D.—Porter and Coates.* 1890.

4. *Etudes sur le magnétisme animal, son histoire, son influence, ses applications utiles, ses dangers. Par M. le Dr. E. Masoin, Professeur à l'Université de Louvain. (Revue des questions scientifiques. Jan. et Avril,* 1890.)

5. *The latest Discoveries in Hypnotism. By Dr. J. Luys, member of the Academy of Medicine and Physician to La Charité Hospital. (Fortnightly Review. June–Aug.,* 1890.)

IN the present state of the controversy regarding Hypnotism it is practically impossible to avoid a direct and

unequivocal answer to the questions: What does the theologian say of its moral aspect in the light of recent developments? Can a Catholic, without violence to his conscience, assume the position of a hypnotizer, or subject himself freely to the strange influence of its manipulations, or, in fine, knowingly and wilfully lend his aid to its practice? Not a few theologians of a high order appear to condemn the practice without distinction. They allow no alternative to the explanation of hypnotic phenomena between imposture and preternatural or demoniac agencies. In the late issue of Ballerini's monumental work[1] we read: "Nova quidem phænomena in somnambulismo (sic enim dicitur) nunc se produnt, quæ sub *suggestionis* nomine veniunt, quæque inter alios describunt Binnet et Feré in suo opere de magnetismo animali; *at ea, nisi omnia sint impostura et collusio, tum physice tum moraliter spectata, adeo sunt contra omnes naturæ leges et honestatem, ut unum satanam auctorem manifeste testentur.*" It is but just to say that Ballerini's editor, P. Palmieri, alone is responsible for this opinion.

Fr. Aertnys, in the edition of his theology which has just appeared, allows a distinction between the physiological or therapeutic effects which can be traced to a material source and such as cannot be ascribed to a natural cause. He seems, however, to doubt that a material origin can be ascribed to the phenomena of animal magnetism[2] and holds that the majority of magnetic phenomena (which are practically the same as those which come under the term of hypnotism) are to be attributed to demoniac influences.

Lehmkuhl, who touches the question of hypnotism in a lengthy note, and accepts, at least theoretically, the facts which have since his writing been corroborated by additional testimony, points out some sort of a test, and thus gives a clue to the difficulty, which lies partly in distinguishing what

[1] *Opus theologicum morale*, vol. II., Tract. VI., sect. i, n. 101.

[2] Nonnullos effectus physiologicos et medicos a causa materiali, *si existat*, produci posse non repugnat.—*Theol. Moral.*. edit. alt., 1890. Tom. I., Lib. III., tract. i., qu. 24.

is and what is manifestly not the result of natural causes.[1] For the practical guidance of priests in a matter which is threatening to become more and more of universal application, we propose briefly to show what hypnotism, as it is commonly understood and practised, is; next, to trace the results of well-authenticated facts, as far as may be, to natural causes, and thus to arrive at some just estimate of the moral value of hypnotizing, from the Catholic point of view.

GENERAL ASPECT.

The past history of hypnotism and its development need not concern us. We have to deal with facts, or rather with effects, which are perfectly clear. Taken in the abstract, they are portentous enough to revolutionize the existing state of society, and that this danger is recognized becomes evident from the fact that nearly every civilized government has within recent times taken legislative steps to control the exercise and forbid public exhibitions of the hypnotizer. This has been generally done at the instance of the medical profession, whose members have usually the best means of ascertaining the monstrous possibilities of an abuse of the power which one person may, by a slight provocation, exercise over one or more others. This power is nearly absolute and extends to the physical, mental, and emotional nature of man. Nevertheless, we must not ignore the fact that the main body of modern hypnotists define hypnosis as a state distinct and different from mesmerism and clairvoyance, as well as from so called spiritism. The phenomena of these latter states are in many cases analogous to those of hypnosis, and it was mesmerism which gave occasion to the

[1] However, speaking of magnetism and spiritism, in the first part of his work, he says in referring to the use of these agencies to cure diseases, "ne in illis quidem sanationibus puto theologum ulli permittere positive posse, ut magnetismi magnetizatorisque opem adeat."—*Theol. Mor.*, vol. I., n. 362. The reason he gives for this opinion is that evil and unnatural results can frequently be traced to one and the same source as those which under the name of hypnotism effect a cure of disease.

experiments whence hypnotism developed. The latter is a certain condition of the nervous system, akin to sleep, into which a person with an aptitude for it can be made to fall, and during which he loses for the time being all consciousness. This state of unconsciousness lasts through various phases of gradually intensified influence upon the physical organism. The first of these is lethargy, during which the hypnotized subject remains motionless and apparently in a condition of utter exhaustion. Nevertheless, the movement of the body is affected by the will and command of the hypnotizer. The next phase is that which has been called the cataleptic stage. The subject has the partial use of his senses, in such a way that, whilst an extraordinary acuteness is developed in one, usually the sense of sight, the other senses are wholly benumbed and powerless. In this state a person reads with a layer of cotton bound over his eyes. He is affected by the different vibrations of light, though the colors which produce these are placed behind a wooden screen one fifth of an inch thick. Whilst he plainly shows in his face and by his voice the emotions produced by what he sees, he remains utterly unconscious, and is not affected by external influences of other kinds. The last stage is a phase of somnambulism. The perceptive sense of sight and hearing is intensified. The subject speaks, answering questions in a way which points to a mechanical association of ideas. The memory seems to revive to an altogether abnormal degree, when compared to the waking state. The hypnotized person acts out every suggestion made to it, imitates, and appears to use his senses, but in such a manner as plainly to indicate all absence of judgment and conscious personal responsibility. The memory is perfect and responds to any suggestion. Commands may be given to a person while in this state of active coma, which he will carry out not only then and there, but, as if by a natural impulse, a considerable time after being aroused from the hypnosis, and when he is perfectly rational and otherwise self-possessed.

We have given the three stages of the hypnotic state as they are commonly indicated by recent writers on the subject. But they are not so much distinct phases as rather points in a series, "capable of infinite variety, extending from the lightest dreams, in which the natural functions are intensified, to the profound state of coma, from which the conscience and the will are completely absent."

THE METHODS OF INDUCING HYPNOSIS.

According to Moll the various methods of inducing hypnosis may be divided into two groups—the mental and the physical.

The mental methods induce hypnosis by giving a particular direction to the subject's imagination; by concentrating the attention upon an arbitrary point, or by raising an image of the hypnotic state in the subject's mind. The latter is generally done by speech, but the mere sight of others in the hypnotic state is sometimes sufficient to induce it. The subject may even generate the image of hypnosis in himself by a mere act of the will, and allow the idea to become so powerful that actual hypnosis takes possession of him.

Among the physical methods are certain abnormal excitations of the senses, principally those of sight, hearing, and touch. A fixed gaze on some object or other, so as to produce a strain on the muscles of the eye or lid. A rapidly revolving mirror, the looking at which produces speedy and extreme fatigue of the eye; the monotonous strokes of a gong; stimulation of the skin and also of the muscular sense, such as continuous rocking, have been recommended by different practitioners as hypnogenetic expedients. But it must be admitted that even in the case of sense-stimuli the mental activity or concentration plays, of necessity, a conspicuous part in the production of hypnosis. According to Luys, there must be in every case a particular condition of the nervous system to allow a person to undergo the treatment which is applied to him. "Above all, he must

yield readily, and submit voluntarily to the treatment of the experimenter."

The waking from hypnosis can also occur in two ways—through immediate action on the imagination or through sense stimulation, exactly as awaking out of natural sleep occurs sometimes from mental causes, for example from habit or from the resolution to awake at a certain hour, and sometimes from loud noise, forcible opening of the eyes, etc.

WHO ARE HYPNOTIZABLE?

Statements in answer to this question differ apparently very widely. Age, sex, physical build, and the general state of health are said to be factors indicating great variety of disposition in this respect. Most subjects of hypnotism are found between eighteen and thirty years of age. Women, hysterical and nervous persons, and generally weak constitutions have been supposed to be more susceptible to its influence than healthy and able-bodied persons. All this is, however, denied by other experimentalists, who say that the notion arises from the fact that those who furnish these statistics are for the most part hospital physicians, who have experimented with weak persons only. Moll asserts that he has hypnotized many very muscular persons, and that Hansen always preferred such for his experiments. Intelligent subjects are, according to the same authority, more easily hypnotized than those who are dull and idiotic or under the strain of excitement. "It is a mistake," he says, "to suppose that women are better adapted than men." At the same time there are certain predispositions in some which are lacking in others. "A person who is easily hypnotized can be hypnotized by any one; but one who is hypnotized with difficulty can only be thrown into hypnosis by a good and experienced experimenter." Heredity sometimes creates such a predisposition. As to the relative number of persons who in a given population are susceptible to hypnotic influence, it is difficult to give accurate statistics. "It may go

on increasing," says Luys, "in the direct ratio with the variety and the efficacy of the new means and processes brought into operation."

CAUSE AND EFFECT.

The sum of experiments in hypnotism goes to prove that the cause which induces the hypnotic state exists in the subject and not in the hypnotizer. The latter may be the occasion of bringing it about, but his activity or presence is not essential. Fischer disclaims that the hypnotizer has any actual influence whatever, and that the induction of hypnotism is wholly subjective. And here it is where hypnologists separate from the school of mesmerists, who maintain that there exists a magnetic fluid, which is communicated by the hypnotizer to his subject. Experiments have sufficiently demonstrated that the presence of a medium is not at all necessary to produce the state of hypnosis. It is probably from ignorance of this fact that it has sometimes been stated that a hypnotizer can directly act upon a subject even whilst removed to a considerable distance from him. But we need not insist upon this difference of opinion, since, whether the occasion be the person of the magnetizer, or some object without, or the subject himself, it must be admitted that, as Father Haan, the Jesuit, states it, the immediate cause is always an abnormal excitation of the nervous system and a correspondingly exalted activity of the imagination.[1] There is nothing to show that any one possessed of nerves and imagination may not be hypnotized under otherwise favorable conditions. The hypnoscope, an instrument for measuring the aptitude of an individual to hypnosis, can hardly claim more than to show that such conditions exist in a more or less developed degree in any one person.

But the causes inducing the hypnotical state as an artificial sleep must not be confounded with the causes which operate upon a person in that state and produce the most extra-

[1] Ueber Hypnotismus (Stimmen aus Maria Laach, Apr. 21, 1890).

ordinary effects. The condition to which a subject under the influence of the hypnotizer is reduced is practically this: A man resigns his person to the will of another. The conscious energy of the latter enters apparently into the physical organism which has been abandoned by its own native will-power, and governs it at pleasure. The subject thoroughly hypnotized does neither reason nor will as it used to do before it entered the hypnotic state, but all his other faculties, including the imagination, the sensitive memory, and the feelings, retain their power of action; only, they are directed by another's intelligence and will. Thus the hypnotizer may make any impression he wishes upon the subject, and the latter will readily receive it; sometimes there is a momentary resistance, perhaps because contrary impressions actually in the sensitive memory are evoked by the association of ideas; but on a repetition of the impression, the resistance disappears and the subject accepts the most absurd statements as facts. The memory in this case is like a photographic plate. It gives back everything it receives with perfectly mechanical accuracy. The external senses act in harmony with the impressions thus made. Sometimes the will of the hypnotizer determines actions which are to occur a long time afterwards. They act like strong resolutions and create a sort of habit which lasts seemingly in proportion to the impression made during the hypnotic state. But the strangest effect of all, produced by the exercise of a foreign will upon a diseased organism, is the complete or at least partial cure of different physical ailments with such modifications of temperament and disposition as accompany a normal state of health. In how far here the intellect and will of the hypnotizer operate directly, and to what extent the intense activity to which the nervous system is subjected produces such changes in the paralyzed functions as to bring them back to their original status, is difficult to determine. Yet, whilst we can imagine both causes to combine and to produce certain physical changes in the diseased system, the results

claimed for this method of cure seem at first sight wholly out of proportion to the operating causes. We might assume that in regard to the effects produced by the hypnotizer upon the sensitive and animal faculties of the subject, philosophy supplies us with sufficient data to disprove that they are necessarily out of the reach of merely natural causes. We know that the mind and the will exercise a direct influence upon our physical nature. We know also that the mind and will of another controls the energies of those who are weaker than himself, whether this weakness arises from a conscious abandonment of one's own powers of reflection and will or from a natural disposition. But when the hypnotizer almost instantaneously cures a physical weakness, or when he transmits, as is sometimes done, the particular weakness of one patient to another who is abnormally strong, and whom the transmitted disease does not affect after he has returned to consciousness, we might be inclined to doubt the coherence here of natural causes with known effects. Nevertheless, it is precisely in this sphere that hypnotism has found the most satisfactory tests. No one, to our knowledge, claims or has claimed that hypnotism can cure all diseases or even every kind of disease. It has been successfully applied in thousands of cases where the nervous system was affected, and this in large hospitals by responsible and eminent physicians and under the supervision of the government authorities. The remedy did not always prove equally effective, and the statistics of hypnosis as a therapeutic agent vary considerably. One table presents 414 cases of various diseases, in which the persons play a more or less visible part—including intestinal troubles, hectic symptoms, and contusions. The result is as follows:

No cure,	71
Slight or passing improvement,	92
Notable and continuous improvement,	98
Cure,	100
Results uncertain,	53
	414

Physicians and scientists for the most part account for these effects upon natural grounds. They hold that the apparent manifestations of the hypnotic state are based upon the laws of the physiology of the brain, and that, far from preternatural agencies intervening, "the new hypnotic therapeutics borrows its means of action chiefly from physical processes, which, acting on the peripheric extremities of the nerves, bring about central reactions of vital importance." As regards the process of transference, by which a disease is passed into another body, Luys says: "These are indeed strange phenonema, which upset what we know in neurology, and in some respects approach the marvellous. But whatever one may say or think, they are real facts. They are therapeutic effects which are verified every day and may be confirmed by the clinical bulletins of the *Charité*." He pronounces these systems of cure perfectly harmless, and they may be used in conjunction with the application of electricity and the magnet.

There are effects here which we cannot satisfactorily explain. We do not see or know their causes. Yet, would it be lawful to conclude thence that they are preternatural? Not at all. The whole field of electricity in natural science is but little more developed than that of magnetism or hypnotism in therapeutics. The authorities who vouch for the harmlessness of the process from a moral point of view are too many and too weighty to ignore their testimony, although we need not commit ourselves to its unconditional acceptance. Man's composition is a mystery, and in the investigation of that mystery we need stop only where revelation begins, so long as our methods do not exceed the lines of morality.

THE MORALITY OF HYPNOTISM.

We have stated in general what are the effects of hypnosis and how they are ordinarily brought about. Examples taken from actual observation might have been given in

illustration, but we wished to be as brief as possible and deal rather with the principles underlying the facts, which are to be met with nearly everywhere in current literature. Let us accept them as true. We need not be able to explain them, unless it were to show that they are not necessarily the result of demoniac action. To prove this, we should have to use other methods than reference to the mere fact that we cannot explain the things we see. How, then, do we determine whether the practice of hypnotism is licit?

In answer to this question we must revert for a moment to the method used to bring about the state of hypnosis, and also to the effect which it produces or is intended to produce. If both are licit, then the act itself is lawful. As to the method of hypnotism for the purpose of curing a disorder of the nervous system, it need have nothing of superstition in it, since, as Lehmkuhl aptly remarks, "plane insolita accidere posse in homine nervorum et cerebri alteratione atque omnino naturali modo, certissimum est: imo hallucinationes stupendas aliquando naturali omnino modo fieri constat."[1] Nor is any undue force exercised, since the patient must give his own consent to the treatment.

But what of the effect? The subject allows himself to be deprived of his reason as well as of his liberty. It is true that to some extent every one does the same in natural sleep; but here we have a forced and unnatural coma, such as is brought about by the use of anæsthetics. We have seen on a former occasion, when treating of the moral limit in the use of anæsthetics,[2] that such remedies may be employed for sufficiently grave reasons, and then with due caution. Suppose that a person suffer from a disease in which all the ordinary remedies fail to give relief, and that it is known to have been cured by the application of hypnosis. This reason would seem sufficiently weighty to allow the experiment

[1] *Theol. Moral.*, P. I., L. II., n. 994, note ad 9.

[2] Am. Eccl. Review, Sept. 1890, p. 198.

under the advice of a prudent and trustworthy physician.[1]

USE AND ABUSE.

We have thus far spoken of hypnotism as an artificial but not preternatural state, and with special reference to its therapeutic application. In doing so we assume as true facts which are sufficiently well authenticated, are admitted by Catholic scientists and physicians of a high order, and could not be either denied or passed over by us without incurring the reproach of an all too narrow conservatism in theology. The civil, legal, and medical professions accept the facts as true, and whatever they may hold as to the utility of hypnotism, it is our province to pass judgment on its moral worth.

It is quite evident from the very nature of hypnotism that it presents many dangers to the individual as to society. Even the protests of medical authorities like Dr. Luys, that, if used with caution and dexterity for the cure of certain diseases, it is absolutely harmless, are met by equally weighty testimony to the contrary. Possibly caution may reduce the danger of hysteria and like effects to a minimum, so as not to exceed the risks which are incurred by the ordinary application of ether, morphia, or cocaine. In the hands of irresponsible parties it would always remain a dangerous instrument. A more positive danger of hypnosis, and which cannot be denied by those who earnestly advocate the system as a therapeutic agent, lies in the fact that, whilst it cures certain diseases, it begets, when often repeated, a tendency towards spontaneous catalepsy and somnambulism. Just as is the case with other stimulants, the system becomes habituated to it, easily demands it, and thus opens the way to a total derangement of body and mind; because the will-

[1] Cautela adhibita et accedente sufficienti causa, licebit, maxime si verum est, morbos aliter non sanabiles ita curari posse: quod tamen sobrio omnino judicio peritorum medicorum bene est explorandum, non leviter credendum, quum constet, similia facta sæpe hallucinatione niti.—Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Mor.*, vol. I., l c.

power to resist its use is weakened in proportion as the physical habit obtains.

But the greatest danger, morally and socially, of the unrestricted practice of hypnotism consists in the power it gives to unscrupulous persons towards the perpetration of criminal acts. A patient under the influence of hypnotic suggestion can be made to do anything, without being amenable to the law, because of the condition of irresponsibility under which he acts. "He can be made in these states to swallow poison by a simple suggestion, to inhale noxious gases, etc. He can be led to make a manual gift of property, and even to sign a promissory note, a bill, or any kind of contract. He is ready to carry out the most minute legal formulæ with a calm assurance which would deceive the most skilful lawyers. Indeed, how can notaries or witnesses suspect any fraud, when even the doctor needs all his experience and all his skill to avoid falling into error? In criminal matters, a man under suggestion can bring false accusations and maintain earnestly that he has taken part in some horrible crime, etc." (Dr. Luys.) It is needless to point out why the civil authorities in many places, when these facts were once recognized, began to interdict the practice for the amusement of the multitude. Legal jurisprudence has since occupied itself with the question, and much has been written for and against hypnotism as a means which, like a two-edged sword, might serve moral reform in the same measure as it lies open to moral abuse. It is maintained that habits of virtue and industry could be as readily forced upon a person as might be the commission of crime. Experiments are said to have proved the efficacy of this means, and if the influence be true and natural on one side, it is not unlikely to be so on the other, except that persons might object to have habits of virtue and industry forced upon them, which would not be an altogether unlikely thing in the case of those who need reform most.

CAUTIONS.

On the whole we cannot avoid the conviction that the practice of hypnotism, however justifiable it may be in theory, is dangerous in practice. We give the sum of conclusions which Masoin has presented to the Belgian Academy of Medicine on this subject, and which seem to be eminently reasonable.

It is wrong to practise hypnotism for the purpose of amusement, in private seances.

The authorities should not allow public exhibitions of hypnotism.

The use of it as a therapeutic agent *in the hands of the public* should be regarded as illegal practice of medicine.

Legislation should be sufficiently armed against every kind of abuse of hypnosis, which deserves to be treated as an attempt against public morality.

The professors of our university (Louvain), above all the medical faculty, should be invited to offer instruction to the students on the subject of hypnotism, especially from the standpoint of physiology, pathology, therapeutics, and medical jurisprudence.

As the practice of hypnotizing has been introduced in several of the great medical institutions of France, we naturally look for some guarantee that even here the danger of an abuse is guarded against. We find such in the school of Nancy, which has formulated three rules of practical prudence.

1. Never hypnotize a subject unless you have beforehand obtained his own formal consent and that of those who have authority over him.

2. Never hypnotize a patient except in presence of a third person who is reliable and honorable, so as to protect alike the interests of hypnotizer and his subject.

3. To ascertain, before attempting the hypnosis, whether the patient is subject to nervous accidents or circulatory dis-

turbances, and of what nature these are. If symptoms of this kind appear, to proceed with prudence, and to obtain, if possible, the advice of a competent practitioner.

CONCLUSION.

From what has been said we draw several conclusions. By all accounts hypnotism is a reality, which proves the enormous power of the imagination upon our physical organism. It has its uses and its abuses like many other things in this world. Perhaps the danger of abuse is the greater of the two alternatives. Are we therefore to condemn it? Lelong, in his excellent analysis of the subject, thinks that, if the bishops of France were to prohibit its use absolutely, owing to the danger which it carries along with it, the measure might be useful, but it would not be opportune. It is true, he says, we should guard ourselves against its abuse; but the abuse of a thing is not always a sufficient reason for proscribing it. Dr. Masoin comes to the same conclusion. Let us take care not to condemn that which appears impossible. A thing may be true without being recognized as such. Hypnotism, he says, may render signal services as a means of curing bodily ailments; if prudently used by capable persons, it may become a means of moral reform, an agent of philosophic investigation. On the other hand, it may prove a dangerous instrument in unscrupulous hands. It is not a subject to trifle with. Leave it in the hands of science, and it may develop some day and assume a more definite character, such as belongs to the manifestations of truth.

Strange to say, yet a wonderful proof of the foreseeing wisdom of the Church,—when the S. Inquisition pronounced upon the subject of animal magnetism thirty-six years ago, it drew the same lines in regard to what are called the occult sciences. It did not censure the practice of animal magnetism, but rather approved it as suitable subject for investigation in the domain of physical sciences. It condemned

those experiments "quæ ad finem non naturalem, non honestum, non debitis mediis adhibitis, assequendum ordinantur,"[1] by means of which the medium pretended to determine future events, and produce effects althogether out of the reach of natural causes, and these frequently immoral, so as to bear the stamp of demoniac agencies. Whilst similar effects may be claimed by certain impostors for hypnotism, they are by no means generally acknowledged as such by those hypnotists whose character and professional position places them above the suspicion of charlatanery or spiritistic intercourse. In one word,—hypnotism, whilst we may not safely recommend or practise it, may not be condemned as *diablerie* simply because it is not traceable to known causes. This is the point we intended to make whilst throwing some light on the question which must be of interest to every intelligent leader of men in our day.

THE SHEPHERD.

WITH charming pen has Virgil traced the pastoral life. Its duties and its cares, the dangers that beset its path, its gains and joys are gracefully interwoven in the smooth motion of his numbers; and though it is the poet's fancy which throws a halo round the shepherd's common day, it seems at times as if the Mantuan Swan had heard the inspiring sounds of revelation, or had had some insight into the realms of grace which opened to the world only when he had passed away. No wonder, then, that the Christian lovers of the Augustan muse should have fancied to see in Virgil's verses prophetic allusions to the birth, life, and resurrection of Christ, Who descended from David, the shepherd king, and sought His first abode on earth amid the

[1] Supr. S. R. Univ. Inquisitionis Encyclica ad omnes Episcopos adversus magnetismi abusus. Aug. 4, 1856.

keepers of Bethlehem's flocks.[1] For, strangely accurate are at times the flights of the poet's genius in their application to revealed truth, which he could not have fathomed by himself. The Christian student, above all the cleric and the priest, can find in the lines of the prince of Latin classics much food for wholesome and practical meditation, a fact attested by the constant reverence which Christian teachers have from the beginning shown for the ancient masterpieces of pagan literature.[2] The shepherd of souls may find the counterpart of his own life and activity in the bucolic battle with the serpent, in the care and precaution of guarding and feeding the flock, the skill and zeal shown in the search after the causes and the application of remedies against disease and death, or even in the rapid sketches of the hireling and the marauder, strikingly showing the harmony of nature and grace.

But we do not intend simply to draw out a parallel between the Theban shepherd and the Christian priest. Rather, in briefly commenting upon the pastoral life in the Church, we look for some conception of that life outside of ourselves. Even Virgil's ideal, near though it comes to the human pattern of the Good Shepherd, must still fall very short of that divine pastorate as found in the Catholic Church, and which we aim to perfect in ourselves. The

[1] Sentit Vives a Virgilio quamquam inscio et imprudenti, mortuum atque redivivum Christum esse laudatum.—Virg. Eclog. V., Arg. iii. Delphin.

[2] It is said that when St. Paul arrived at Puteoli he visited the tomb of Virgil, and, weeping, gave utterance to a prayer which has been preserved as a fragment of the Mantuan liturgy :—

Ad Maronis mausoleum
Ductus fudit super eum
Piæ rorem lacrimæ :
Quantum, inquit, te fecissem,
Vivum site invenissem,
Poetarum maxime.

Daniel (Thesaur. hymnol.) supposes this stanza to be part of a sequence, given in Bettinelli's work *Del Resorgimento D'Italia*, T. ii., page 18, note, and belonging to the Church of Mantua.

poet aptly expresses the far grander character of Rome, where a shepherd of a superior order than that of Tityrus is destined to rule:

> Urbem quam dicunt Romam, Melibœe, putavi
> Stultus ego huic nostræ similem, quo sæpe solemus
> Pastores ovium teneros depellere fœtus:
> Verum hæc tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes,
> Quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi. [1]

And so, when we see the pastoral life of Christ as unfolded to us by St. Gregory, or St. Bernard, or St. Charles, our conception of its dignity, and, together with that, of its beauty, rises far higher than the poet could conceive it. As dignity and beauty, so sacrifice and joy go hand in hand. In fact, the one is a necessary condition of the other. The cares and responsibilities of the pastoral office are the qualities that exalt its admirable dignity. Jesus, Son of Sirach, tells us that there are joy and glory and honorable gifts in the pastorate,[2] but he makes these advantages rest upon humility and labor.[3] The shepherd, then, who would preserve unto himself the joys and honors of his state can do so only in effectually recognizing the responsibilities of his position. These responsibilities consist in the feeding and guarding his flock.

Every pastor in the Church repeats daily, at Terce, the words: Bonitatem et disciplinam et scientiam doce me. This expression of the royal shepherd David outlines the characteristics of the true priest: goodness, discipline, knowledge.

The goodness of which David speaks here is not that natural quality of temper which readily yields to outward influences. Its measure is not the approval of the many.

[1] Buc. Eclog. I. 20.

[2] Take thy place, that thou mayest rejoice for them (whom thou rulest) and receive a crown as an ornament of grace, and get the honorable gift of contribution.—Ecclus. xxxii. 1.

[3] Have they made thee a ruler (rectorem)? he asks, and then continues: Be not puffed up, but act as one of themselves; have care of them and remain with them, and when all things have been accomplished, rest thyself.—Ibid.

Its strength is not the patronage of the powerful. Its attraction has no connection with the beauty of staff and gown. On the contrary, where the shepherd discriminates, the multitude is likely to censure. His prudence often seems weakness. His very solicitude looks at times like neglect. The richest pastures do not give the fairest wool, nor do sweet herbs produce the healthiest milk.

Si tibi lanicium curæ—fuge pabula læta.[1]

The young are his special care. Whilst watching their innocent sport, he surrounds them with safeguards, lest tanglesome brush or pitfall or stone might hurt their limb and endanger their life. Hence goodness needs its sister-care, restraint and discipline. There are lands which, worse than barren wastes, seem full of blooming herbs. Their marshy luxury is dangerous food. Their sluggish streams infect the blood. The good shepherd wisely hedges in the flock and keeps it near the limpid fountain of truth, whence streams of sacramental grace, continually renewing themselves, irrigate the ground. And when a truant lamb attempts to break the wholesome hindrance, he pursues it and brings it back with gentle violence. He is ever occupied about his flock. The sheep follow him in good order as he walks before them. They observe his ways, whilst he, solicitous for their safety, often looks back and calls them on, lest, loitering by the way or surprised by the darkness, they fall a victim to the hidden viper's venomed sting, or to the tooth of ravenous wolves, or, worse, to the feigned care of treacherous hirelings.

But discipline, even though it be allied to genuine goodness, is but of small avail to the shepherd when without knowledge. Christ told His disciples that the good pastor would know his own, and they would know him. That is to say, he would not only recognize each individual member of his flock, but he would make himself recognized, understood, and trusted by them: "Et proprios vocat nomina-

[1] Geo. III. 385.

tim." He possesses the art which teaches them to hear his voice and follow his lead. He is skilled in the choice of provender best suited, according to the changing season, for the healthy growth of his sheep. He studies the symptoms of disease, "morborum causas et signa," which sometimes silently destroy the flock, and he has remedies at hand for every case. He is practised in the ready use of those weapons which, like David's sling, smite the lion and bear or the strong, armed Philistine. At home, in the church and school, his care for the flock is equally visible. He acts out the poet's precept:

Disce et odoratam stabulis accendere cedrum.

The atmosphere is pure and redolent with the sweet smell of cedar, emblem of immortality. Patiently and prudently he selects and trains up helpmates efficient in the task of preserving order. Whilst all is done in peaceful harmony, there is also apparent the strength that is invariably allied to concord and unity of purpose. With their assistance he need not fear the prowling wolf or hidden serpent—

—Custodibus illis
Nocturnum stabulis furem incursusque luporum.

With watchful care he rouses his brother at the approach of danger,

Cape saxa manu cape robora, pastor,
Tollentemque minas et sibila colla tumentum
Dejice.

Such is the ideal shepherd of the pagan poet; such is the good pastor of Christ's flock composed of immortal souls. "And you my flocks, the flocks of my pasture, are men!"[1]

[1] Ezech. xxxiv. 31.

REFLECTIONS OF A PRIEST ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

THE recent animated discussion concerning the respective claims of parochial and state schools has had one signal advantage. It has brought out into strong relief the contrasting views, which are no doubt the sincere convictions of the different classes of American citizens in whose common interest the question is being argued and by whose will it must eventually be settled. This difference of views does not extend only to the contesting parties as directly opposed to each other, but also to the spokesmen who apparently defend the interests of the same side. The religious and secular press of the last few weeks gives ample evidence of this fact, and it would be an easy task to group the expressions of Catholics as well as non-Catholics in such juxtaposition as to make the asserted facts (and even principles) of one contradict those of the other, although both plead the same cause and believe it to be a vital issue.

We are not concerned, for the nonce, with the inconsistencies of non-Catholics. It is our object to promote unity of purpose and to aid in the selection of such means as serve best to its accomplishment. In any case, it seems to us fruitless to invite a final struggle on a question of this kind, so long as there appears to the outside observer an absence of common understanding as to the real issue for which we fight, or at least of consistent methods of stating that issue in our challenge. It is this want of clear and uniform views on what we claim, and what we have a right to claim, which seems to us not only to prevent the prospects of a peaceful settlement of the question, but which makes the impression upon the non-Catholic public, most of whom desire no doubt to deal fairly in the matter, that we have no real grievances beyond such as are suggested by the undue desire of hier-

archical influence among the Roman Catholic clergy. One of the most influential organs of sober thought, whose aim is independence from sectarian bias, after reviewing the opinions of representative men, Catholic and non-Catholic, on this subject of the school question, sums up in the following conclusion: "One thing that will strike our readers is that there are two utterly diverse and contradictory views, mutually exclusive, held among Catholics on public schools." What these two opposing views are, it is hardly necessary to state. Catholic spokesmen have said the public school-system is "godless, immoral, and debasing," At the same time others, of equally high standing and authority, not only bespeak tolerance for the public school system, but they patronize these schools and accept positions of trust for their defence and salaries for the aid they give in conducting them. This looks very much like a contradiction in principle, the more difficult to understand since we claim this struggle to be one for conscience' sake. Yet, as far as the position goes which the Catholic Church as such espouses, there is not a shadow of inconsistency. The struggle is old with her. It was one of the first encounters she had with pagan Rome, when, still in her infancy, she recognized the duty of opposing Christ's truth and morality against the old philosophy and the licentious power of the Roman aristocracy. What, then, does our inconsistency mean, who proclaim that we fight in her name, whose one great note is Catholicity, that is to say, union of aims and methods in the perpetuation of her divinely committed mission? That is a question which many must have asked themselves among our own intelligent people within the last ten years, when the parochial school movement began to take some positive shape.[1]

[1] We must here pay the tribute of honorable exception to our German fellow-Catholics in America, who with singular consistency, and, as is evident in many instances, with much sacrifice of personal interests, have not only succeeded in establishing good schools which they support, but have forced the acknowledg-

As a matter of fact, we believe there is no real difference, certainly not of the fundamental principle involved in this struggle, among the authorized champions of the Catholic cause. The things said at one time or other are all true under certain respects. It strikes us very much like two men claiming the same piece of ground for the same party. One says it lies at Belle Alliance and consists of so many acres; the other says it lies at Waterloo, and consists of a hundred times as much. But the place is the same,[1] and so is the measure, only the denominations differ.

The present actual position seems to be this: The intelligent majority agree that education is necessary to the preservation of good order in the state. To facilitate the obtaining of a certain measure of education, the state, which with us means the representatives in the main of the people, determines to provide public schools, for which the citizens are equitably taxed. This measure being in operation, Catholics find that, as a whole, the system does not favor them. They object to its perpetuation as a part of our common government. The grounds upon which they state their objections are:

First: The public schools under the present system, according to which they must confine their instruction to the exclusive training of the intellectual faculties, give insufficient scope for the proper moulding of the moral faculties, and hence cannot be justly said to educate even to the duties of good citizenship, which requires the training of the heart through the influence of supernatural motives. This, religion, in one form or other, is alone capable of attaining.

Second: That the public school system, in excluding all positive Christian influence, does not maintain the position of neutral ground as claimed for it, since it necessarily fosters agnosticism and atheism, which is no less definite because it is negative. Skepticism, which is begotten by subordinating the supernatural truths to the acquirements of intellectual cul-

ment of their intelligent zeal in this respect from those who on other points strongly oppose them.

[1] The French call the town where the battle of Waterloo was fought *Belle Alliance.*

ture, unfits the child for the right appreciation of the former when given to it only at intervals. The system ignores the fact that this training of the heart must be constant, and that, if not given in school, it must be left to the parents; that a large number, probably the larger, of those who have need of imparting this training to their children are incapable of doing it, either from want of time or knowledge, or else because they are too indolent to do so.

Third: That the public school, in some instances at least, becomes the channel of instilling sectarian bias, either through text books which do injustice and violence to the feelings of Catholics, or through teachers who cannot separate their feelings from their intellectual convictions. And whilst this is an accidental evil, the system of public schools offers no efficient guarantee against this introduction of bias; nor can it, since the majority of the representatives of it, who govern the public schools, are free to exercise their own discretion, to the actual violation of the non-sectarian principle.

Fourth: That, as we cannot safely and conscientiously use the public schools in every place and at all times, and are therefore dependent on local and personal circumstances for the advantages which they may offer, we are obliged to abandon the system and build our own schools, where we may not only educate without danger of having our religious convictions interfered with, but can at the same time impart that element of training to good citizenship which is avowedly absent from the public schools.

Fifth: Apart from these questions of fact, there arises a question of right. We are taxed for the maintenance of a system which does not, and if carried out consistently, cannot benefit us. This is said to be unjust, on the basis that where there is no representation, there exists no right of taxation. How far this principle is applicable in our case we shall see directly.[1]

[1] We purposely omit to urge the claims of Parental Rights, except in so far as they are already contained in the statement of the above objections. These rights

The clergy are principally made responsible for the forcing of these objections, and being acknowledged leaders in religious matters of their people, there is no reason why they should shirk this responsibility. Nevertheless, in the light of existing facts, and with the evident experience of the fact that an unequal and indiscriminate putting forth of these reasons leaves an erroneous impression as to our real position, not only on non-Catholics, but on Catholics who note the general progress of the discussion as well, it becomes a duty no less of justice than of prudence to ascertain how far it is consistent with common sense to urge our rights in the abstract when we ourselves do not admit them uniformly in the concrete. Have we any right, or is there any gain in assuming an aggressive attitude against the public schools, so long as we are not forced to send our children into them, whilst on the other hand they are acceptable to the bulk of the population and whilst it is well understood that in many districts Catholics patronize them and do so not unlawfully? Thus, where these schools, being free from sectarian bias, or having Catholic teachers, offer no hindrance to religious influences, or where parents are known to supply the religious instruction, Catholics may send their children there, and sometimes do so by the express advice of the bishop or priest. When we tell our Catholic people that the public school system is rotten, godless, and corrupting, we may stigmatize a danger to which the system lies essentially open and which is verified in many cases, as ample testimony from those who ought to know seems to show; yet the impression made upon those who do not reflect, and they are the bulk of our people, is wholly different. They will look upon the children of the public schools as moral lepers; and if any of the latter hap-

lie indeed at the very root of the educational question, but can be urged with effect only against compulsory education, since it would be difficult to prove that, and to what extent, a mere system of education such as ours actually violates these rights. We shall speak of the subject of compulsory education in a separate paper, as there is danger of its becoming an integral part of our public school system.

pen to be Catholics, or are known to be as good or better than their critics, they will begin to doubt seriously either the judgment or the knowledge of those who so roundly denounce what admits of serious distinction when applied in practice. Hosts of our public schoolteachers are Catholics. We must suppose that they represent a respectable and intelligent portion of our congregations. How do they bear this lashing of the public schools on our part, which strikes them no less than those who may more justly deserve it.

We say: But our people must be educated to the appreciation of the parochial school system and forewarned of the danger to our faith inherent in the public system. They are voters. They will have a part by representation in shaping our laws and guarding individual right.—We admit, the contention is just. Yet there are many better ways of educating our people than by indiscriminate vilifying of our neighbor, which is actually done whenever we expressly brand the public system, though it be the system only. We are speaking of the clergy, not of the men who represent the political rights. These must study the question from a distinct standpoint, which it may be our secondary duty to support. Neither the Sovereign Pontiff, nor the Syllabus, least of all the Baltimore Council bid us condemn the public school system, except in so far as we are obliged not to patronize the system as such, and we are urged in the interest of our faith, of which the Church is the teacher, to provide positive and all-sided education for our children. This is the spirit of the Church's legislation throughout, and the aim of whatever she condemns as noxious in principle to the religious interests of the people.

On the grounds of equity it is stated, that our people are taxed for the maintenance of the schools both public and parochial; that this double burden justifies a general movement against a system of education to which we cannot conscientiously subscribe; that in order to rouse our people to such a movement all the possibilities of the public

system and its actual defects must be drawn out into full prominence, and that therefore an unequivocal condemnation is not only justifiable but a work of charity, inasmuch as it will relieve our people of unnecessary taxes.

As for the justice of the case, we have no mind to cavil, although it is doubtful whether under a constitution such as ours, in which Congress[1] has the right to levy taxes for the maintenance of institutions which further the arts and sciences, any real objection could be lodged by the minority against the will of the voters to dispose of common taxes in any particular way, although it may not benefit all and even hurt some. The taxes are not exorbitant, and the benefits we receive from this disposal otherwise so manifold, that the exaction of them has in no way the character of unjust oppression. Moreover, the number of Catholics who at present really benefit by the public school system, as for example in the mining districts or in the city of New York, where Catholic teachers and children in large numbers frequent these schools, compensates to a certain extent for what they lose elsewhere. If it be said that we are under heavy contribution, owing to the necessity of maintaining the parochial schools, we cannot lodge this as an objection against the public school system, since we should have to support our own schools as well if public schools did not exist. Of course, the principle admits of argument on both sides, but we have to deal with an actual fact, both in the existence of the public school system and in the popular view concerning it. Many Catholic jurists and political leaders, about whose sentiments of fidelity to the Catholic Church there can be no doubt, and who are equally pronounced in the defence of religious training as an essential element of education for thorouhgly good citizenship, admit the force of this fact.[2] Certainly our laws may be amended

[1] Art. I. sect. 8.

[2] Only a few days ago the Hon. Thomas R. Elcock, in an address delivered at the opening of the Philadelphia Catholic High School, said, in referring to the public

and modified and changed, and the public must be educated to the necessity of doing so. But this is hardly done by prejudicing large numbers of citizens against our claim, by urging it with undue vehemence and a disregard for existing circumstances.

The most effective way to awaken the American people to a just sense of our claims is to allow the two systems time to work out their comparative results. That cannot take so very long, and hardly longer than it will take to undo the present prejudice by the proclaiming of the rights of conscience, which the people who are educating their children in the public schools don't understand to be rights of conscience at all. If we build our schools as we build our churches, without aid from the state; if we imitate and adopt what is best in the public school system and add what is better, namely, religious instruction, we shall have a free hand, and the fruits will repay all present outlay.

This, we contend, can be done, and on the part of the priest should be done, not so much by rousing the sense of injustice in our people, as by convincing them through constant instruction of the importance and necessity of religious education to secure the temporal as well as the eternal well-being of their children. Thus we would defeat the aims of those who make our objection to the public schools an occasion of casting distrust upon the priesthood

school tax: "It is lawful taxation, although they (Catholics) share not in its benefits. As long as the public school system is conducted within the powers of the Constitution, no one can object, and there can never be a division of the schoolfund or taxation of the state in favor of any religious denomination. That is settled and does not require discussion in Pennsylvania. The same argument which is urged why the state should educate, and that without religion, can be made in favor of the Church educating with religion, except that there is no moral obligation on the state to educate at all, which there is upon the Church."—We have quoted this portion of an address which openly vindicates the Catholic view of the educational question in its principles, simply to show the trend and tenor of public opinion among educated Catholics who are not blind to the force of their rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

and especially upon the hierarchy by the senseless cry of "ecclesiastical encroachments." There are men who must and will represent the legal aspect of the question, and who go to the foundation of right, by testing whether and how far the state, in making school laws, is infringing upon parental and individual rights. But that aspect is secondary for us and relates to the wisdom of our statesmen. We may support and aid their activity towards more equitable laws in every way, but our character as ministers of religion neither requires nor advises a wholesale denunciation before our people of the public school system; because it exists by law; because as carried out it is not absolutely bad; because at present we are not forced to accept it for ourselves. When and where the law compels Catholics to adopt that system, then and there is room for solemn and consistent protest. In the meantime writers in the press and public speakers have a perfect right to draw the attention of the people to existing abuses and the unsoundness of the underlying principle.

Nor can we, on the other hand, consistently approve of the present system of public education, simply because it does not satisfy and does not pretend to satisfy what we consider the essential requirements of education. And if we could accept it as satisfactory at any time, we should still object to its being made compulsory, inasmuch as the right of the state is limited by the parental right in that case. Compulsory education can be justified, on Catholic as on ethical grounds, only when the parent actually neglects to impart such knowledge as is required to guarantee the common safety and important interests of a society. Even in that case the rights of conscience must still be respected.

If the matter of a compromise with the state schools were proposed to us, I doubt whether it would be wise to accept it, even with the prospect of lessening the cost of education to Catholics. The history of European states where the clergy and the schools have been supported from the state

funds might teach us some lessons on the subject. The sacrifices which Catholics have made for their religion have always tended to make them more attached to their Church, and we need not fear that they would be less loyal in consequence to the government that accords them religious liberty. Nevertheless, if the clergy should find it wise to advocate a compromise, it would not be so difficult to find a platform the principles of which could be accepted by Catholics as well as non-Catholics in the United States. Mr. Tolman Smith, who is acknowledged to be "one of the most careful and thorough scholars we have on school matters," marks four principles as indicating the actual position of the American public on the subject, and we must confess that we should have no objection to subscribing to them if no flaw vitiated them in the application.

"1. Public money for the parts of education of which the state is the natural judge and conserver.

"2. The rights of conscience secured.

"3. Compulsion with respect to the knowledge that makes for the safety of the state.

"4. Freedom with respect to that which unites the human with the divine.

"With these principles established in law and in practice, something is wrong outside of the school when in a nation like our own, or a nation of churches like France, the altar fires grow dim."[1]

LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS.

III.

THE aim of the true artist is, as we have seen, to awaken intelligent pleasure by means of the beautiful. In painting the human figure he would therefore have to repre-

[1] From a paper entitled "Tendency of Foreign Schools as to Religious Instruction," in *The Independent*, Sept. 4, 1890.

sent, in the expression of the countenance as well as by the attitude of the body, such moral and intellectual qualities as are the special endowment of man. This, as I said, can be done only by representing the human figure *in action*. Of course, action is not necessarily to be understood as bodily motion, for the activity of the soul may be shown in many ways, even when the body itself is at rest. But action in painting may address itself to different minds and for different purposes. It may simply aim at producing in the beholder what is commonly called æsthetic pleasure, or, in other words, produce the spontaneous consciousness that what we see is true, and that this recognition of truth is a satisfaction and help to us in some way. Fine art in this sense is analogous to the friendships, recreations, and urbanities of life as aids to social happiness. It is the lowest grade in the scale of fine art, for it appeals to the commonest necessity and the commonest faculty of intellectual perception. Under it are classed that which is novel, or comic, or pretty, as well as those subjects which are generally comprised under the term of "genre" and "still life." They belong to fine art inasmuch as they represent truth in some form or other; and truth is an element of æsthetic beauty. It must be added, however, that truth in this sense always excludes moral evil, because that which is morally ugly cannot be æsthetically beautiful.

Again, the action represented in the painting may be intended to elicit those civic virtues or that spirit of activity by which the life of a large community, such as the State, is kept in a healthy condition. This sphere is superior to the one first mentioned, because it discards on the whole that which is merely humorous and addresses itself to our sense of duty, loyalty, humanity, justice, patriotism, valor, or heroism; in short, to those qualities in man by which a union of feelings is produced, and which tend to cement a commonwealth through the cultivation of industry, peace, and prosperity. To this category belongs principally historic painting.

Last of all, there remains that field for the artist wherein he forgets, as it were, the things which immediately surround him. He strives after the ideal of a beauty above the earth, of which he has caught a glimpse, and which has left in his soul a longing such as that of which Dante speaks remembering Beatrice. Full of the fair vision, he has no eye or ear for aught else. It becomes the source of his constant inspiration.

> Io mi son un, che, quando
> Amor mi spira, noto, ed in quel modo,
> Che detta dentro, vo significando.
> (Purg. xxiv. 53).

It is a " vita nuova " in the truest sense of the word. There is in it nothing vulgar, nothing mechanical. Even the logician may take exception to the want of rule and order in the construction of thought; but the artist, somehow, carries away the strong minds by the wonderful accents of his brush. His subjects elevate, yet they can hardly be analyzed according to the ordinary rules of criticism. They are like songs without words, which nevertheless speak more powerfully than the best-trained tongue. His works are the expression of truth, but not of material, physical truth, if I may say so, but of that which revelation suggests and with which the heart and the mind correspond. The touch of the fundamental note sets vibrating others, creating a perfect harmony, although not perceived by the common ear.

But whilst the religious painter draws his subjects from revelation, he represents the facts of sacred history. Is a painting, therefore, which depicts such facts, necessarily religious art? No. So far as a work of art represents scenes taken from Holy Scripture it is merely an historic work. It may bear witness to the wonderful intervention of God during the old theocracy, or to the grand fact of Christianity, which has its meaning to the student of history, whether Pagan, Jew, or Christian. It is simply the representation of a well-authenticated occurrence and must be

dealt with in the history of facts. It may teach a wholesome lesson of universal or particular virtue, but need go no farther. Christian art, in the true sense of the word, rises higher. It teaches not only the *fact* of Christianity, but also aims at convincing the beholder of the *supernatural character* of that fact. Herein lies the distinction between historic and religious art.

But let us now return to the individual. The religious character does not lie in the dramatic attitude of the form imitating devotion. The head and eyes may be raised toward heaven with perfect gracefulness of the outline, and yet the religious element be wanting in the figure. It is difficult precisely to say in what this element consists. It may be sought for in the perfect blending of all the qualities which go together to make up the devout life, leaving no weakness to mar the lyric beauty of the whole expression. To produce it upon the canvas requires certain conditions within the soul of the artist. What the magic touch is in the musician who thrills the soul by playing upon the well-attuned instrument, or what the candor of voice is by which we implicitly trust a person, even against appearances, because the sound somehow opens to us the interior of the soul, that is the truly religious element in art. Its perfect expression is not so much a difficult task as it is the rarest of gifts, although it depends only in part on native talent.

I have so far outlined the three fields which limit the scope of fine art, by suggesting the kind of subject proper to each sphere. Genre as well as still life, history, and revelation furnish the respective material. However, it is not necessary that every subject be relegated to a distinct category. The several subjects belonging to different orders may be blended and harmonized so as to make one complete and perfect work. The flower interprets the language of simple joy or personal virtue, but it also serves as an emblem of patriotism, civic honor, and the mysteries of religion. So also the painter of animals may express in the lamb the natural joy

and innocence of youth, whilst the Christian artist uses the same subject to draw our thoughts to the subject of the Redemption. And even apart from symbolism, the artist may give to the brute a perfection of human qualities which, whilst never actually found in the same, suggests to man the higher lessons of his own estate.

Such works of art are very much like the parables of Our Lord. They serve for the demonstration of Christian perfection. A good example of this kind seems to me to be a picture by Schenk, which you have probably seen. It is called "Anguish," and represents a mother-sheep standing on a snowy plain over her dead young. The sky is dark, beset with winter clouds. Around the mother are grouped in an irregular circle a dismal flock of dark ravens, awaiting with eager avidity the abandonment of the dead lamb, which the maternal instinct of the sheep protects. The features of the latter are inexpressibly touching. Deep anguish in the knitting of her brow and shaded eyes, the head is lifted up toward the sky, as if expecting help thence against the increasing circle of the dark birds of prey. The hot breath, distinctly visible as it issues from her parted mouth upon the chilly air, makes you almost hear the wail of affliction which presses on the mother's heart. It is a beautiful lesson of appeal to heaven amid the sorrows of earth. Yet we know that this animal, lacking the power of reflection which in reality gives the keen edge to human sorrows, is wholly incapable of suffering such pains as a mother's heart endures upon the loss of her child. But the artist succeeds to my mind admirably in attributing this quality of the human soul to the brute without any incongruousness in carrying out his subject. Our next object will be to explain in detail how the various emotions of the soul are to be expressed in the features, so as to preserve the character of fine art in a painting.

PROCURATOR FISCALIS.

PRACTICALLY one of the most important and responsible positions in the ecclesiastical curia of the United States is that of the Procurator Fiscalis. The bishop is the supreme judge in his diocese. He is at the same time the principal executive. In cases of accusation against a minor cleric there are, it is true, ways of appeal to a judiciary council to have the matter judged. We have also a norm in the Instruction of the S. Propaganda "Cum magnopere," according to which criminal and disciplinary cases are juridically settled. But every priest is not a lawyer. Even if he has made a thorough study of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, which few among us can be expected to do, its practical application requires a talent distinct from the knowledge of his duties and rights. Just as the man of affairs in secular life, though conversant with his obligations and privileges as a citizen, leaves their adjustment and defence in the hands of an attorney, so the priest who for one cause or other finds himself obliged to assert his rights, whether by way of defence or in lodging a complaint, naturally looks for an advocate.

There are many reasons why a priest may not care to make a complaint or even to repel an accusation. If he gains his point, he may never lose the odium which follows his having done so in cases where the judge has obligations towards, or feelings in behalf of the party who is worsted by the force of facts. On the other hand, it is almost impossible to guard that perfect independence of feelings, as it commonly exists in civil courts, quite inviolate in ecclesiastical circles. Nor does this fact make of necessity against justice. We honor a brother who allows fraternal charity or kindly feeling, begotten by association, to temper the blind rigor of justice, provided it does not subvert the same, and turn into injustice against another. In fact, the cases brought into ecclesiastical courts are not ordinarily supposed to deal with questions of

justice and injustice in the strict sense of the word. They are questions of the interpretation of laws that would be readily obeyed by both contesting parties if their meaning were clearly understood. Contumacy and open violation, once admitted, of the laws of the Church, put the cleric out of the range of ecclesiastical litigation. There is at most only room for canonical censure or excommunication. The term "justice" therefore in connection with ecclesiastical discipline has a wider signification than that which obtains in the codes of criminal law. It means equity, fairness. It may consist in the possession of privileges which a peacefully inclined man may feel repugnance to contest, yet the forfeiture of which would imply some injury to his charge. Perhaps, too, he might be convinced that by reason of personal disposition or peculiarities, or owing to some previous misunderstanding between himself and his superiors, it would be impossible to make his claim properly understood or acknowledged. All this makes it desirable to have some advocate, a sort of attorney general, to whom he could refer his grievance for a plain statement at the proper place. By this means personal feeling is lessened. A hearing is readily obtained. The facts are likely to be brought out in their simple reality, without that undue emphasis which comes from the consciousness of having a grievance. The motives for discontent are weakened.

For this reason the last Plenary Council of Baltimore prescribed the appointing of so called *Fiscal Procurators* (Procurator Fiscalis, qui etiam Promotor et Advocatus Fiscalis nominatur).[1]

The Holy See, in an Instruction of the Propaganda inserted in the Appendix to the Acts of the late Plenary Council of Baltimore,[2] in which a number of canons for the

[1] Conc. Plen. Balt. III., Lit. x, n. 301.

[2] De modo servando in cognoscendis et definiendis causis criminalibus et disciplinaribus Clericorum in Fœderatis Statibus Americæ Septentrionalis.—Append. Conc. Pl. Balt. III., p. 287, n. xiii.

guidance of the American clergy in matters of litigation are laid down, says among other things: *In qualibet Curia Episcopali procurator fiscalis constituetur, ut justitiæ et legi satisfiat.*

Judging from the meaning of the word, the office of fiscal procurator was originally identical with that of an administrator of temporalities, and in the old law the term is frequently used to denote the chief officer of public ministry, who is to defend the interests of the commonwealth, take note of public disturbances within the realm, call the attention of the executives to whatever needs righting, and to see that every one obtains a fair hearing and a just judgment. A similar office devolves upon the Promotor fiscalis under the modern ecclesiastical law.[1] In some instances he holds the position of a judge in criminal cases. Not so in the United States, at least as his position is defined by the Decrees of the Council, unless he receive a special mandate. If he brings action into the ecclesiastical court, he does so ordinarily as the representative either of the person who deputes him or in the name of what might be called the ecclesiastical commonwealth. He brings a grievance, public or private, officially to the notice of the ordinary, who examines the case juridically or hands it over to his vicar or an appointed auditor. The fiscal procurator is, however, obliged to be present at the trial and witness all the judicial proceedings against the person accused, so as to defend him if need be.

By the terms of the Council of Baltimore [2] the Procurator Fiscalis receives his appointment from the bishop.

[1] Ecclesiæ quippe suus quoque est fiscus, res nimirum ac jura complectens, quæ ad publicum ejus bonum pertinent.... Quapropter eidem merito proprius datur patronus, qui tamquam procurator, ubicumque fuerit opus, pro ejus tuitione interveniat, ac nominatim de iis, qui scelere admisso ordinem socialem perturbarunt, inquirendo, et crimina eorum judici deferendo, justitiæ rite administrandæ vi officii sui cooperetur. Qui publicum hoc officium sustinet, etiam in curia episcopali procurator seu "promotor fiscalis" jure novo appellatur. Nilles, *Commentaria in Concil. Pl. Balt. III.*, Tit. x., cap. ii., pag. 357.

[2] Conc. Pl. Balt., Tit. x., n. 301.

His duties are outlined as follows: He is to guard against any violation of justice and law in the diocese. If any breach of order occur, he is to request of the bishop to institute inquiry. If the bishop depute to him the charge of prosecuting the case, he is, in the words of the Council, to remember that he is carrying a charge against his brother; nevertheless, he is to be guided by the firm and sole motive of administering justice and vindicating the law.[1] His presence in criminal cases is absolutely necessary, so that, if he be absent, trial must be suspended, and all transactions thus done are null and void.

Having assumed the charge of presenting a case, it is his duty to see that it obtains a judicial hearing, that witnesses as well as the accused be summoned and examined. If the latter refuse to appear, he is declared contumacious. It belongs to the office of fiscal promotor to warn the accused that he select an advocate to defend him, or to have one appointed "ex officio" if the accused fails to do so; to have a time appointed for the trial and for the sentence; to see that the defence be taken down in writing, and warning be given of the sentence, in order that an appeal may be lodged. If no appeal is made, he is to see that the sentence be carried out.

In one word, he is to be the defender of justice and law, and any cleric having a grievance in equity may refer it to him. It goes without saying that the office of fiscal procurator, being on the whole one of personal trust, entails more than ordinary responsibility. The violation of secrecy would be in itself an injustice against those whose rights he is charged to protect. "Silentium religiosissime servetur a regiis consiliariis."

[1] Sit quidem nunquam immemor, se contra fratrem causam agere, sed etiam firmo semper ducatur proposito "ut justitiæ et legi satisfaciat."—L. c.

TITULAR FEASTS IN OCTOBER.

I. GUARDIAN ANGELS (OCTOBER 2).

(*Sixteen Churches reported in* 1888; *among them the pro-cathedral of St. Cloud.*)

Oct. 1, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.
Pro Clero Romano, idem.

2, Fer. 5. *Alb.* SS. Angelor. Custod. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. In 2. Vesp. nulla com.
Pro Clero Romano, ut supra In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

3, Fer. 6. de 2. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. Reliq. ut in fest. Gl. 2. or. *Concede* 3. *Ecclesiæ* vel pro Papa Cr. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.
Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.
Per Reliq. Oct. except. Fer. 3. ut in Calend. cum Cr. et (except. 2. Vesp. Sabb. et tota Domin.) com. Oct. in Laud. Vesp. et Miss.

7, Fer. 3. de 6. die infr. Oct. ut Fer. 6. præc. 2. or. S. Marc. 3. SS. Sergii et Soc. In 2. Vesp. com. Oct.
Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.
Fest. S. Dionys. et Soc. perpetuo mutand. in 11. Oct., pro Clero Romano in 12. Oct., quando hoc anno de iis fiet uti simplex.

8, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. a cap. de seq. com præc.

9, Fer. 5. *Alb.* Octava SS. Angelor. Custod. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. reliq. ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.
Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

II. ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI (OCTOBER 4).

(*Eighty-seven Churches in* 1888.)

Oct. 3, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.
Pro Clero Romano, idem.

4, Sabb. S. Francisc. de Assis. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. ut in Calend. cum Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. S. Gallæ et Dom.

5, Nihil de Oct.

Fer. 2. (3. pro Clero Romano) 4. 5. et 6. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

7, Fer. 3. de 4. die infr. Oct Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Quantum* vel ex Breviar. *Beati Francisci* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Audiant* (de com plur. mart.) 9. Lect. et com. S. Mart. 3. or. *Concede* Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

10, Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, idem—Fest. S. B. Joann. Leonard. perpetuo mutand. in 12. Oct. quando de eo hoc anno fiet ut simplex.

11, Sabb. Octava S. Francisc. Dupl. Lectt 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Audiamus* (de com. plur. mart.) vel ut in fest. Miss. ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Dom.

III. HOLY ROSARY (OCTOBER 5).

(*Forty-seven Churches in* 1888.)

Officium SS. Rosarii novum ab anno 1888.

Oct. 4, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Com. Dom. tant.—*Jesu tibi sit gloria* et Cr. per tot. Oct.

5, Dom. Solemnit. SS. Rosarii Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. ut in Calend. omiss. com. SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra—Nihil de S. Galla.

Fer. 2. (3. pro Clero Romano) 4. 5. 6. (Sabb. pro Clero Romano) ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct.

7, Fer. 3. de die 3. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Novum* vel ex Breviar. *Dei Filius.* 3. Noct. ut in festo 9. Lect. et com. S. Mart. in Laud et Miss. 3. or. de Spirit. S. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

11, Sabb. de 7. die infr. Oct. ut Fer. 3. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *De via* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. 2. or. de Spirit. S. 3. Eccl. vel pro Papa Vesp. de seq. ut in 1. Vesp. fest. com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Dom. tant.

12, Dom. *Alb.* Octava SS. Rosarii Dupl. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Fuit vir* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lectt. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. fest. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et seq.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend.—Nihil de SS. Rosario.

IV. ST. BRUNO (OCTOBER 6).

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Oct. 5, Pro utroq. clero Vesp. de seq. com. præc. tant.

6, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Brunon. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Justus.* Reliq. ut in Calend. cum Cr. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

7, Fer. 3. de 2. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. *Beati Brunonis.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sed veniens* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Marc. (Ant. et Vers. ex 1. Vesp.) et SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

Fer. 4, 5, 6. (Sabb. et Dom. pro Clero Romano) ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct.

11, Sabb. de 6. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Bene* vel ex Breviar. *Beatus.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Constringenda* vel ut in fest. 2. or. Concede 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa Vesp. a cap. de Dom. com. Oct.

12, Dom. *Alb.* ut in Calend. omiss. suffr. et Prec. 2. or. de Oct. tant. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) et Dom.

Fest. S. Eduard. permanent mutand. in 16. Oct., et pro Clero Romano in 21. Oct.

13, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Octava S. Brunon. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si istum* vel ut in fest. Miss. ut in fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

V. ST. DENNIS (OCTOBER 9).

(*Fourteen Churches in* 1888.)

Supponitur S. Dionysius solus esse patronus harum ecclesiarum; festum sociorum ejus proinde perpetuo figendum est prima die libera, quæ in Calendario commun. est 11. Octobris, pro Clero Romano 12. Octobris; eorum officium pro meliori judicio ibidem indicatum.

Oct. 8, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. (or. prop. de S. Dion. omiss. mention. Socior.) Com. præc.

9, Fer. 5. *Rub.* S. Dionys. Ep. Mart. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. off. un. mart. Lectt. 1. Noct. *A Mileto* Respons. ex off. unius mart. 2. Noct. pr. 3. Noct. ut in Breviar. Miss. *Sacerdotes Dei* Epist. et Evgl. pr. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 6. (Sabb. pro Clero Romano) Dom. (col. rub.) Fer. 2. 3. 4. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct.

10, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

11, Sabb. *Rub.* Off. Sociorum S. Dionys. (fix. ex 9. hujus) Semid. Off. plur. mart. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. ex 9. Octob. Miss. ut in fest. S. Dionys. omiss. in orat. *hodierna die* et *Dionysio* 2. or. Oct. 3. *Concede* Cr. Vesp. a cap. de Dom. com. præc. et Oct.

12, Pro Clero Romano Com. Socior. S. Dionys. ante com. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. Socior. S. Dion. et Oct.

15, Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, idem—Fest. S. Victor. perpetuo mutand. in 21. Octob.

16, Fer. 5. *Rub.* Octava S. Dionys. Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Tempus* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *De hoc* (plur. martyr.) vel ut in fest. Miss. ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VI. ST. FRANCIS BORGIA (OCTOBER 10).

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Oct. 9, Pro utroqe Clero Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. Nulla com.

10, Fer. 6. *Alb.* S. Franc. Borg. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Beatus vir.* Cr. In 2. Vesp. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

11, Sabb. de 2. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ut in Breviar. *Beati.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Perfectus* (de com. Abb.) vel ut in fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa Vesp. a cap. de Dom. Com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

Dom. Fer. 2. 3. 4. (5. pro Clero Romano) ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct.

16, Fer. 5. de 7. die infr. Oct. ut Sabb. præc. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sancti* vel ex Breviar. *Deridetur.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Arbitror* vel ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.)

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.

Fest. S. Hedwigis pro utroq. Calend. perpetuo mutand. in 21. Oct.

17, Fer. 6. *Alb.* Octava S. Francisci Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ecce enim* vel ut in fest. Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VII. ST. CANICUS (OCTOBER 11).

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Oct. 10, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Or. *Intercessio* Nulla com.

11, Sabb *Alb.* S. Canici Abb. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Off. Conf. non Pont. 1. loc. Lectt. 3. Noct. de Abb. Miss. *Os Justi* (de Abb.) Cr. per. tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom.

Dom. (col. Abb.) Fer. 2. 3. 4. (5. pro Clero Romano) et 6. ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct.

16, Fer. 5. de 6. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Bene* vel ex Breviar. *Deridetur.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Apostoli* vel ut in fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. a cap. de seq. Com. Oct.

17, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. Oct. (ut in 1. Vesp.) De oct. S. Canici fit ut simplex.

18, S. Lucæ ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Laud. Miss. et Vesp.

VIII. MATERNITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

This feast, according to the general concession, occurs on the second Sunday of October, whereas it has been granted to the original province of Baltimore for the third Sunday of this month. It must therefore be celebrated in the United States on the third Sunday, except where, as in the diocese of Cincinnati and others, a subsequent concession of the Roman Ordo has placed back the feast on the second Sunday.

Pro diœcesibus ubi in usu Ordo Romanus: Oct 11. Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

12, Dom. Matern. B. M. V. ut in Calend. Per tot. Oct. ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct.

19, De die Octava nihil fit ob occurrentiam festi Puritat. B. M. V.

IX ST. EDWARD (OCTOBER 13).

(*Twenty Churches reported as dedicated to St. Edward, all presumably to St. Edward the Confessor.*)

Oct. 12, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. Nulla com.

13, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Eduard C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Beatus vir.* Cr. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 3. 4. (5. pro Clero Romano) 6. Sabb. (nihil de Oct.) et Dom. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct.

16, Fer. 5. de 4. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Quantum* vel ex Breviar. *Beati* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Hæc tria* vel ut in fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Fest. S. Joan. Cant. pro utroq. Calend. perpetuo mutand. in 21. Octobris.

20, Fer. 2. Octava S. Eduardi Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. 2. Mach. ex heri 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si istum* vel ut in fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et S. Hilarion.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

21, Fer. 3. S. Joan. Cant. (fix. ex heri) ut in Calend. ad 20. Octob. cum Lectt. de Script. diei et 9. Lect. cum com. S. Hilarion.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

X. ST. TERESA (OCTOBER 15).

(*Thirty-three Churches in* 1888, *among which the pro-cathedral of Lincoln.*)

Oct. 14, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. sine com.

15, Fer. 4. *Alb.* S. Theresiæ Virg. Dup. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *De virginibus.* Reliq. ut in Calend. cum Cr. per. tot. Oct. In. 2. Vesp. nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

16, Fer. 5. de 2. die. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. *Quoniam hodie.* 3. Noct. ex. Octavar. *Notandum* vel ut in fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

Fer. 6. Sabb. Dom. Fer. 2. ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct.

21, Fer. 3. de 7. die infr. Oct. ut. Fer. 5. præc. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Tam magnum* vel ex Breviar. *Nunc nobis.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Alias* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Hilar. 3. or. Concede. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.)

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

22, Fer. 4. Octava S. Theres. Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *De virginibus* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Intendat* vel ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

XI. ST. GALL (OCTOBER 16).

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

16, Fer. 5. *Alb.* S. Galli Abb. Dispone Off. et Miss. in fest. et per Oct. ut indicatum supra pro S. Canico, selectis lectionibus ex Octavar. pro Abbatibus vel ex. Breviar. alternando lectt. 2. Noct. de communi quando fit de Oct. 17. et 21. Octobris.

23, Fer. 5 Octava S. Gulli. Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex. Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. (de com. 1. loc.) 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ecce enim* vel ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Fest. SS. Redempt. perpetuo mutand. in 27. Oct.

XII. ST. HEDWIGIS (OCTOBER 17).

(*Six Churches in* 1888.)

Oct. 16, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. sine com.

17, Fer. 6. *Alb.* S. Hedwigis Vid. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Mulierem.* Reliq. ut in Calend. cum Cr. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra.

Sabb. Dom. Fer. 2. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct.

21, Fer. 3. de 5. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Operatur* vel ex Breviar. *Agrum.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Perpendis* (Mart. non Virg.) vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Hilar. in Laud. et Miss. in qua 3. or. *Concede.* Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

22, Fer. 4. de 6. die infr. Oct. ut heri. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Prospiciens* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Vides* (Mart. non Virg.) vel ut in fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

23, Fer. 5. de 7. die infr. Oct. ut heri. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Brachia* vel ex Breviar. *Agrum.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Quæstio* (Mart. non Virg.) vel ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.).

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

Fest. S. Raphael. perpetuo mutand. in 25. Oct., pro Clero Rom. in 27. Oct.

24, Fer. 6. *Alb.* Octava S. Hedwig. Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Duplicia* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Et hic* vel ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

25, S. Raphaelis Dupl. maj. (fix. ex heri.) Com. SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend.

XIII. ST. LUKE (OCTOBER 18).

(*Eighteen Churches in* 1888.)

Oct. 17, Pro. utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. sine com.

18, Sabb. *Rub.* S. Lucæ. Evgl. Dupl. 1. cl. cum. oct. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Dom. Fer. 2. (5. pro Clero Rom.) et 6. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct.

21, Fer. 3. de 4. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Propter* vel ex Breviar. *Sancta.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sed quando* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Hilar. 3. or. *Concede* Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

22, De 5. die infr. Oct. ut heri. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Matthæus* vel ex Breviar. *Scriptum* (com. Apost.). 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si quem* vel ut in fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. de seq. Com. Oct.

23, De 6. die infr. Oct. ut heri. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Et quamvis* vel ex Breviar. *Sancta.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Fortasse* vel ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. Com. Oct.

25, Sabb. Octava. S. Lucæ Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. *Sancta.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sicut* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. Præf. Apost. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et S. Evar.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com præc.—Fest. S. Bonif. permanent. mutand. in 27. Oct.

XIV. MATERNITY OF THE B. VIRGIN (OCTOBER 19).

(*Eleven Churches in* 1888.)

Pro diœcesibus Ordine Romano utentibus vide supra; in aliis autem diœcesibus clerici qui privatim officium Romanum recitant ratione Tituli hac dominica officium Maternitatis iterare tenentur.

Fest. S. Petri hoc anno fit ut simplex.

Oct. 18, Pro utroq. Clero. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Dom. tant.—*Jesu, tibi sit gloria* per tot. Oct.

19, Dom. Matern. B. M. V. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. omiss. com. S. Petri.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Fer. 2. (5. pro Clero Rom.) 6. (Sabb. pro Clero Rom.) ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. Cr. et Præf. B. M. V. per tot. Oct.

21, Fer. 3. de 3. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Novum* vel ex Breviar. *Dei Filius.* 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Hilar. 3. or. de Spirit. S. Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

22, De 4. die infr. Oct. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. *Dei Filius.* 3. Noct. ut in fest. 2. or. de Spirit. S. 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

23, De 5. die infr. Oct. ut heri. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Beata* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

25, De 7. die infr. Oct. ut Fer. 4. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *De via* vel ex Breviar. *Dei Filius.* 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. 3. or. de Spirit. S. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, de S. Evaristo hoc anno fit ut simplex.

26, Dom. Octava Maternit. Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Fuit vir* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. Dom. In. 2. Vesp. com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, idem cum com. S. Evar.

XV. ST. WENDELIN (OCTOBER 20).

(*Nine Churches in* 1888.)

(See the Pastor, III., 343).

Fest. S. Joan. Cant. permanent. mutand. in 21. Oct. pro utroq. Calend.

Oct. 19, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

20, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Wendelini C. non P. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Off. C. non P. 1. loc. Cr. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

21, S. Joan. Cant. (fix. ex heri) m. t. v. ut heri ritu infr. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

22, Fer. 4. de 3. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ad hanc* vel ex Breviar. *Deridetur.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar.

Audistis vel ut in fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. Vesp. de seq. Com. Oct.

23, De 4. die infr. Oct. ut heri Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Quantum* vel ex Breviar. *Beati.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Hæc tria* vel ut in fest. Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

25, De 6. die. infr. Oct. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sancti* vel ex Breviar. *Deridetur.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Constringenda* vel ut in fest. Vesp. a cap. de Dom. com. Oct. et S. Evar.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

26, *Alb.* Dom. ritu infr. Oct. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Vesp. a cap. de seq. Com. præc. et Dom.

27, Fer. 2. Octava S. Wendel. Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si istum* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. Vig. de qua. ult. Evgl. Vesp. de seq. Com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

XVI. ST. RAPHAEL (OCTOBER 24).

(*Twenty-one Churches in* 1888, *among which the cathedral of Dubuque.*)

Oct. 23, Vesp. de seq. sine com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem cum com. præc.

24, Fer. 6. S. Raphaelis Arch. Dupl. 1. cl. cum. oct. ut in Calend. In 2. Vesp. nulla. com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In 2. et Vesp. cum seq.

25, De 2. die infr. Oct. Semid. In 2. et 3. Noct. diebus de Octavar. (25. 27. 29. 31.) repetendæ sunt lectiones festi 3. or. *Concede* Cr. per tot. Oct.

26, Dom. *Alb.* ritu infr. oct.

28, Nihil de Oct.

30, Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1 Vesp.) com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Siric. permanent. mutand. in 5. Novemb.

31, Fer. 6. Octava S. Raphael. Dupl. In 2. et 3. Noct. repetunt.

lectt. festi. 9. Lect. et com. Vig. de qua ult. Evgl. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

XVII. SS. SIMON AND JUDE (OCTOBER 28).

(*Four Churches in* 1888.)

Oct. 27, Pro utroq. Clero. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

28, Fer. 3. *Rub.* SS. Simon. et Judæ App. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. In 2. Vesp. nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra.

29, De. 2 die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Duodecim* vel ex Breviar. *Scriptum.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Pro hac* vel ut in fest. 2. or *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

30, De 3. die infr. Oct ut heri. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si omnium* vel ex Breviar. *Fundamenta.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Quid est* vel ut in fest.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

31, De 4. die infr. Oct. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Isti* vel ex Breviar. *Fundamenta.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Qui me* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. Vig. de qua ult. Evgl. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

Nov. 3, De 3. die infr. Oct. Omn. Sanct. cum com. Oct. SS. Simon. et Jud. et præf. App. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) Com. Oct. OO. Sanct. et S. Vitalis.

Fest. S. Carol. permanent. mutand. in 5. Nov. pro utroq. Calend.

4, Fer. 3. Octava SS. Simon. et Jud. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Fundamenta* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Facile* vel ut in fest. Com. Oct. Omn. SS. et S. Vital. Vesp. a cap. de seq. Com. Oct. 5. S. Caroli. (fix. ex heri) Com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

XVIII. ST. SIMON (OCTOBER 28).

(*Four Churches in* 1888.)

Ubi solus S. Simon. est patronus, de S. Juda fit. ut dupl. 2. cl. 29. Octobris. Quoad lectiones et orationem vd. De Herdt, III., 108.

Other titulars that occur this month are St. Remigius (One Church) St. Colman (One or two doubtful Churches) St. Callistus (One Church) St. John of Cant. (Two Churches) St. Donatus (One Church). Those who have to celebrate them will, during this season of the liturgical year, meet with no special difficulty in constructing their octaves.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

The Imperata at Benediction.

Qu. Where it is customary to sing the *Imperata* at Benediction of the Bl. Sacrament, must it be omitted on a feast *dupl. I. classis*, as is the rule for the Mass?

Resp. There is no rubric defining the matter. The *Imperata* is not obligatory at Benediction, hence it may be omitted at any time. Where it is the custom to sing it, conformity to the general rubrics of the Mass would suggest its omission on feasts *dupl. I. classis.*

The October Devotions.

The devotions in honor of our Bl. Lady of the M. H. Rosary continue of obligation as in previous years, since 1883.

We refer our readers for information regarding the prescribed manner of conducting these devotions to the *American Eccl. Review* of last year, page 351 (Sept. 1889), and the prayer in honor of St. Joseph, which is to be added; see page 392 of the same volume.

We said on that occasion, that if the devotions take place in the morning, the Rosary, Litany, and other prayers may be said before, during, or after Mass, interpreting the words *Sacrum inter preces peragatur* of the Encyclical in that sense. Since then, however, we have learned that the question of how these words are to be understood had been referred to the S. Congregation, and the answer given was that the Rosary is to be said *during* the Mass. We give the decree below.

If these devotions take place in the evening, the Bl. Sacrament is to be exposed, and the Rosary, Litany, etc., to be recited *coram Sanctissimo.* Benediction follows with the

usual ceremonies. "Optamus autem ut *ad has preces* conveniente populo, *eodem tempore* vel sacrum at altare fiat, vel *Sacramento augusto ad adorandum proposito*, sacrosancta deinceps hostia pius supplicantium cœtus rite lustretur." (Encycl. 1 Sept. 1883.)

We also call attention to the privilege according to which *private exposition* of the Bl. Sacrament in poor churches, etc., means in this case that the Pyxis may be taken out of the Tabernacle and Benediction given with it to the people. This is different from the ordinary rite of private exposition of the Bl. Sacrament. Cf. *American Eccl. Review*, Vol. II., pp. 323 and 325 (May 1890).

DUBIUM.

Eodem Decreto (20 Aug. 1885) præcipitur quod si mane Rosarium cum Litaniis recitetur, Sacrum inter preces peragatur; quæritur num hæc verba ita intelligi debeant quod Rosarium uno eodemque tempore dicatur quo Missa celebratur, vel potius Missa antea celebranda sit, ac postea Rosarium cum Litaniis recitetur quemadmodum fieri solet in Palentina Diœcesi?

S. R. C. rescribendum censuit:—

Affirmative ad primam partem; *Negative* ad secundam. Die 16 Jan. 1886.

Decr. Auth. 5957. Dub. V.

Purifying the Pyxis after Mass.

Qu. Is it allowable to wait until the end of Mass, to purify the ciborium before the celebrant leaves the Altar? There are good reasons for waiting. In the first place, it takes some time, particularly from a lately ordained or scrupulous priest, to purify, and the congregation is kept waiting. Moreover, the priest, when he is not hurried, will be more careful in purifying.

Resp. We know of no authority which expressly states that the ciborium may be purified after Mass. Rubricists universally take for granted that this is done immediately after Holy Communion. No doubt exceptional circumstances would justify a deviation from the prescribed practice without thereby sanctioning it as a rule which might be followed

indiscriminately. Perhaps the following, which we take from the English edition of an approved manual on the "Sacred Ceremonies of Low Mass," [1] may give some light as to what is to be done when the priest has reason to fear that a rather long delay in purifying the ciborium would weary the congregation.

"It sometimes occurs that the ciborium, after the particles have been consumed, remains in such a manner covered over with the fragments, that in spite of the utmost diligence it is impossible to purify it well, and this causes a certain amount of uneasiness lest the congregation should be wearied. . . . The best method (under these circumstances) would appear to be, after wiping the ciborium and pouring wine into it once or twice, if many fragments still remain, to leave the ciborium on the altar, first covering it and putting under it the pall. On the priest's return to the sacristy, and having taken off the sacred vestments, he will take the ciborium and wash it carefully with water or wine; he should put this ablution in a suitable vessel, preserve it carefully, and after a certain time throw the ablution into the sacrarium." [2]

This seems sufficiently suggestive of what might be done in analogous cases. It is needless to say that the ciborium could be placed in the tabernacle and purified later at a Mass where the fear of inconveniencing the congregation need not be entertained.

ANALECTA.

INDULGENCES FOR THE FEAST OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI (4 October).

The following Brief of Leo XIII, although published two years ago, [3] may be new to many of our readers. It accords

A Plenary Indulgence to all the faithful who visit any church or public oratory on the feast of St. Francis, or during its

[1] The Sacred Ceremonies of Low Mass according to the Roman Rite. From the stereotyped Roman edition corrected and enlarged by a priest of the Congregation of the Missions.—Dublin: Brown and Nolan, 1881.

[2] Loc cit., pag. 146, note.

[3] It had been issued in June, 1883, but was not made public at the time.

octave, and pray there devoutly for peace among Christian rulers, for the extirpation of heresy, for the conversion of sinners, and for the prosperity of the Church. The customary conditions are a contrite confession and the reception of holy Communion.

In those churches or chapels where solemn devotions in honor of St. Francis are held during a *novena* or an *entire month*, the faithful who attend these devotions once or oftener gain *each time* an indulgence of 300 *days*, but this does not apply to private devotions. These Indulgences are also applicable to the souls of the faithful departed. [1]

LEO P. P. XIII

Universis Christifidelibus præsentes litteras inspecturis salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Ad augendam Fidelium religionem et animarum salutem cœlestibus Ecclesiæ thesauris pia charitate intenti, omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus Christifidelibus vere pœnitentibus et confessis ac S. Communione refectis, qui quamlibet Ecclesiam seu publicum oratorium die festo S. Francisci, vel uno ex septem diebus continuis immediate subsequentibus, cujusque fidelium arbitrio sibi eligendo, singulis annis devote visitaverint, ibique pro christianorum Principum concordia, hæresum extirpatione, peccatorum conversione, ac S. Matris Ecclesiæ exaltatione pias ad Deum preces effuderint, quo ex hisce diebus id egerint, Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum Indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Insuper eisdem Christifidelibus corde saltem contritis, quoties vel novendiali supplicationi, vel piis exercitiis per mensem in honorem S. Francisci celebrandis adfuerint, tercentum dies de injunctis eis, seu alias quomodolibet debitis pœnitentiis in forma

[1] From the terms of the Brief, it appears that these Indulgences expire with the year 1893.

Ecclesiæ consueta relaxamus. Quas omnes et singulas Indulgentias, peccatorum remissiones, ac pœnitentiarum relaxationes etiam animabus Christifidelium, quæ Deo in charitate conjunctæ ab hac luce migraverint, per modum suffragii applicari posse indulgemus atque elargimur. In contrarium facientibus non obstantibus quibuscunque præsentibus ad decennium tantum valituris. Volumus autem ut præsentiam Litterarum transumptis seu exemptis etiam impressis, manu alicujus Notarii publici subscriptis, et sigillo personæ in Ecclesiastica dignitate constitutæ munitis, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur quæ adhiberetur ipsis præsentibus, si forent exhibitæ vel ostensæ.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, xi Junii 1883.

Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

TH. *Card.* MERTEL.

EPISTOLA CIRCULARIS AD CUNCTOS ORBIS EPIŞCOPOS.[1]

Illme ac Rme Domine,

Norma liturgica est, quam continuo urget S. R. C. haud posse in eadem ecclesia, multoque magis in eodem altari, publicæ venerationi exponi duas vel pictas tabulas vel statuas, eundem repræsentantes sanctum, et si de alma Virgine agatur, Deiparam sub eodem titulo repræsentantes. Hujusmodi principium nullam exceptionem patiens præ oculis habuit S. R. C. cum per Decretum d. d. 24 Februarii volventis anni[2] nonnullis satisfecit dubiis, quæ Procurator Generalis Prædicatorum proposuerat, ad consuetudinem quod spectat imaginem exponendi in ecclesiis, ubi imago SSmæ Virginis a Rosarii titulo nuncupata antea venerabam-

[1] From the Ephemerides Liturgicæ, July 1890, page 353.

[2] The Decree referred to here contained an answer to the dubium: An liceat Imagini B. M. Virg. de Rosario in eodem Altari Imaginem parvam Pompejanam supponere, ut vulgo dicitur *sotto-quadro?* S. R. C. respondit *Negative*.

tur fideles, aliam ejusdem tituli imaginem, quæ in ecclesia nuper erecta in Valle Pompeja peculiarem obtinet cultum.

Quidquid reapse sit de particulari loco, quo Deipara ejusmodi ratione colitur, nec non de gratiis ac beneficiis, quæ fidelibus dignatur elargiri Deus, qui illuc convolant, aut Virginem illic honore habitam invocant, citra controversiam ponitur, effigiem illam, vel in ipsis accessionibus, si aliquot nullius momenti varietates excipias, Deiparam Virginem a Rosario dictam repræsentare. Haud ergo exponere eam licet in ecclesiis ac publicis oratoriis, in quibus alia sub eodem titulo imago a fidelibus religione colitur.

Hinc, quamvis post dictum vulgatum Decretum, plures porrectæ SSmo Domino Nostro pet tiones fuerint, implorandi causa ut una cum antiqua Deiparæ imagine a Rosario nuncupata, nova in aliqua ecclesia relinqueretur, cui denominatio Pompeja superadditur; enunciato nihilominus principio derogari nunquam potuit, quod responsa S. R. Congregationis eo super negotio informat. Quæ responsa, dubio super Indulgentiis inspecto, hucusque expositum confirmant, eas nempe duas imagines unum idemque constituere: proinde, quin novæ excludantur Indulgentiæ, quas concedere Sancta Sedes poterit, ad concessas quod attinet, eadem responsa ad conditiones eo fine præscriptas se referunt.

Interim, ut ejusmodi petitionibus imponatur finis, simulque liturgicæ normæ in similibus casibus tenendæ in memoriam redigantur, hæc S. C. SSmi Domini Nostri voluntate audita opportunum censuit præsentem E. T. mittere epistolam, plenissime fidens, fore ut E. T. illa utatur, ut devotio æqui confinia haud excedat, quæ ceterum tantopere in Virginem Deiparam commendatione digna est ac salutaris.

Subscriptus Cardinalis Sacris tuendis Ritibus Præfectus peculiaris exhibet E. T. existimationis sensus, dum fausta cuncta a Domino adprecatur.

E. V. Addictissimus uti Frater

Romæ d. 20 Maj. 1890. CAJETANUS Card. ALOISI MASELLA.

Vincentius Nussi *a secretis*.

BOOK REVIEW.

WISSENSCHAFTLICHE HANDBIBLIOTHEK. Erste Reihe. Theol. Lehrbuecher.

I. KATHOLISCHE DOGMATIK, von Dr. Hermann SCHELL, Prof. d. Theologie an d. Universitæt Wuerzburg, Paderborn, 1889.—Fred. Schœningh. Band I. pp.-i-xxi-425. Band II., pp. x-346.

The inexhaustible wealth of revelation, the perfectibility of man's mind, the ruling of God's providence, under which truth is gradually evolved in human consciousness, make progress in theological science both possible and necessary. Obscurity in terms and propositions disappears only with the lapse of time, under the study of many minds; errors, which may lurk on the human side of any science, are but gradually eliminated. The old principles need constant adjusting to the growing forms and phases of heresy. New works on Theology are therefore ever welcome, at least when they are the product of master minds, such as the volumes before us. The publisher of these books has designed a series of manuals with a view to offer ecclesiastical students, priests on the mission, and intelligent laymen concise yet adequate digests of Exegesis, Apologetics, Liturgy, Church History, Pastoral and Dogmatic Theology, Histories of Philosophy and Dogma.

Specialists, eminent in these branches, most of them professors in the leading Catholic universities of Germany, are to contribute. The present volumes begin the series, and contain four of the six books intended to complete the Dogmatic course. A third volume yet to come will furnish the two closing books. The sources of Revelation, the Existence and Nature of God, the Trinity, Creation,—limit their subject matter. These are familiar lines, of course, but they are drawn in new and in somewhat original fashion. Instead, for instance, of following in the beaten path, by establishing the possibility and fact of Revelation, the author leaves these questions, we suppose, to the Manual on Apologetics, and enters at once on an examination of the matter, form, and channels of Revelation. Starting with the leading of St. Paul that God's word to man "is the power and the wisdom of God unto Salvation" (Rom. i. 16; I. Cor. i. 24), he shows that revelation is not a mere out-flowing of Divine goodness, as the Protestant theory would have it, but a *law* of truth and grace *binding* the human intellect and will (Th. 1); a cov-

enant of love and redemption between the creator and creature involving consequent mutual rights and duties (Th. 2); a kingdom of truth and grace, a visible institution wherein God's purpose of Salvation is applied to men (Th. 3); its contents and Divine certainty requiring an objective theocratic medium for reaching the individual soul (Th. 4). These and the following propositions on S. Scripture and Tradition are treated with great depth and fulness, as are also the questions on the nature and fact of Inspiration. Those most satisfactory to the earnest student will be the proofs of the existence of God. They are searchingly analyzed, and the peculiar value of each as a logical source of special groups of Divine attributes is well drawn out. Thus the Cosmological argument is shown to explain Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Immutability, and Eternity. The attributes consecutive on the Divine Intellect and Will flow properly from the Teleological argument. The absolute Truth and Beauty of God are proved by the Ideological argument, whilst the Ethical argument shows the basis of the Moral attributes.

We do not recollect having read anything more sublime than the author's conception of the Trinity. He looks upon this Mystery as the centre of all revealed truth and purpose. Our idea of God as being supreme and absolutely self-sufficient, yet as deigning to enter into most intimate union with His Creation, is secured by our knowledge of His triple Personality. As triune, God stands at the beginning of time; as threefold, He awaits His creation at the term of its development to take it up into the eternal rest of blissful intercommunion with Himself.

As triune we may conceive God as the essentially independent and unconditioned, whilst His most intensely vital communion with His creatures, His becoming in fullest sense their life content and object, is completed through the origin of the Divine Persons from their one eternal principle. The Divine missions are the royal end of all God's gracious works, the content of all His promises, the meaning of all heavenly blessings, the strongest motive and impulse of aspiration towards entrance into His everlasting sanctuary. This conception of the central truth of faith permeates the scientific exposition of its dogmata; indeed, it points to the leading characteristic and purpose of the whole treatise. The work admirably embodies the true idea of Theology sketched by S. Thomas in the first question of the Summa as a science chiefly speculative, and in an eminent way, both speculative and practical, appealing first and mainly to the mind, yet sending its influence directly from head

to heart. To the student of Theology Dr. Schell will be a safe guide; a guide at home in the highest place of the highest science; one, however, who asks of his followers patient toil. The preacher, too, of the Divine word will find in these volumes, not indeed sermons ready to hand, but thorough exposition, theoretical and applied, of religious truth.

ANALECTA LITURGICA. Fasciculus V. Junio, 1890. London.

The fifth fasciculus of Mr. Weale's careful work, which we noticed last year, brings some interesting and important additions to the liturgical treasury of the fifteenth and sixteenth century. We have the calendars of Hereford, Rouen, and Toledo with their *festa triplicia* and *dominicalia*, and other quaint yet typical oddities in the way of ritual.

The *Thesaurus hymnologicus* is, however, as might be expected, the most attractive portion, and we fancy also the most valuable. The lyrics of the Catholic Church are of all things in her worship the most direct if not the most accurate reflex of the liturgical life within her at any given period. These hymns are the simple expressions of devotion, not the fine forms and rich imaginings of poets. But they are poetry withal, for they are the songs of love, and the lover is essentially a poet. There is a melodious rhythm wherein the rhythm accommodates itself to the melody, and the elegant art of the Augustan poets is supplanted by naive play of rhyme and assonance and frequent alliteration. But they never fail in their purpose, and if we admire the verses less than we love the sentiment and the melody, the gain is all the same. Mark the curious assonance of the following verses, taken from a hymn in honor of the Bl. Virgin.

Mater ave
Quæ nos a væ
Liberasti carceris,
Fac cum clave
Quæ conclave
Summi Regis diceris
Nos firmari fœderis.

Mortis hora
Natum ora
Pro tibi psallentibus,
Et decora
Nos decora
Virgo vitæ moribus

Or, again, in a hymn *De Beata Maria,* dating to the fourteenth century.

Tu jucunda
Res et recens,
Summe munda
Summe decens,
Summi Regis regia;
Summum paris
Summa parens,
Expers paris
Summe parens
Summe . . . . egregia.

Tu lacuna
Documenti
Sol et luna
Firmamenti,
Opportuna
Firma menti
Dux et lux lætitiæ.

Ros et rosa
Gloriosa
Dulcis, fragrans, primula,
Mel et melos
Pande cœlos
Nobis prece sedula.

Perhaps the devout zeal of the rhymster may be suspected to have outdone the good sense of devotion in the following:

Mundamini, mundamini
Laudantes Matrem Domini,
Ut mundus mundæ Virgini
Laudes solvatis hodie.

Honor sit Summo Numini,
Ejusque solo nomini,
Quod præparavit homini
Tantæ matronam gratiæ.

Hæc est illa mirabilis,
Illa incomparabilis
Quæ partus ineffabilis
Novitatem exhibuit.

Even the unpoetical, we had almost said unintelligent, reader can hardly mistake the spontaneous tone of joy and devout enthusiasm

which must have animated the writers of these hymns. One understands the temper of the ages of faith before the "Reformation" far better from such expressions, which must have quickly kindled the fervor of those who repeated them, than from the stories of exaggerated superstition which are supposed to belong to this time.

We have no doubt the reader will thank us for the following specimen of the thirteenth century. Notice the Tmesis of the Alle-luja, allowing the insertion of the six lines, as if to make the entire piece a protracted cry of joy in honor of the Nativity of our Bl. Lady.

Alle- resonent omnes ecclesiæ
Cum dulci melo symphoniæ
Filium Mariæ genetricis piæ,
Ut nos septiformis gratiæ
Repleat donis et gloriæ,
Unde Deo dicamus: luja.

We are impatient to see the continuation of this very useful collection, and are sure that, if known, it will gain many friends among those interested not only in the liturgy of the Church but in the sphere of art and letters.

THE RIGHTS OF OUR LITTLE ONES: or First Principles of Education in catechetical form. By Rev. James Conway, S. J.— New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

No thought could have been more fruitful than that which suggested this publication. The writer justly confesses to the difficulty of the task, which appears more easy than it is, of condensing a larger work into the form of a catechism. Bellarmine is said to have remarked that his children's Catechism cost him more labor than some of his great works on theology; and Walter Scott said of the Life of Napoleon in three volumes, that he had not had the time to write it in one. Accordingly more than ordinary credit is due to Father Conway for his zeal and industry in digesting his former treatise.

We do not remember now how the matter of compulsory education was stated in *The Respective Rights and Duties of Family, State, and Church in regard to Education* upon which this catechism is based, but the directness with which the question and answer confront us in the latter raises doubts, not only as to the prudence but also as to the correctness of the sentiments expressed under numbers 52, 53, and 54, and the deductions therefrom. "The State," says the author, "cannot justly

enforce compulsory education, even in the case of utter illiteracy, as long as the essential physical and moral education are sufficiently provided for." And why? Because "it infringes on the natural rights of parents and children." We can readily conceive a condition of things when with the general progress of useful culture *utter illiteracy* might become a serious obstacle to the general welfare of the state, and when the latter may justly exercise the right of compelling all its citizens to use their quota of intelligence for the common good or to avert a common evil. It is true that such power vested in the state may become a danger to the individual right; but that may be said of all state power. The line between parental and state right, though it exists, cannot be so accurately defined as to exclude utter illiteracy from the sphere of the latter. It may follow "with logical necessity, that the state has the right to prescribe the quality of the food, clothing, lodging," etc.—But what of it? The right would always be limited by the law of justice on one side and the common interest within the bounds of right reason on the other. We speak, of course, of a representative commonwealth, and simply object to the statement in its absolute form. The government of a nation like ours may find good reason to prescribe the quality of houses we are to lodge in, because other kinds are liable to easy destruction from hurricanes or because such houses are the only protection against malarial influences. Why? Not because a man has not the inherent right of building as he likes or lodging as he wishes, but because his likes and wishes in this case present an obstacle to the common interest, and interfere with the rights of others, who represent a larger aggregate of that good for which the state has been formed.

The following question (55), "has not the state the right *and duty* to exterminate illiteracy?" is answered in the affirmative: "The state has the right to exterminate, or at least diminish, illiteracy, as far as this is possible—without the violation, however, of divine, personal, and domestic rights." In spite of the saving clause this sounds very much like a contradiction of the unqualified statement that "the state cannot *justly enforce compulsory education* even in the case of *utter illiteracy*."

Of course, there are ways of defending propositions the truth of which depends on the application of reason to justice, and we have no doubt a plausible plea could be made in favor of the orthodoxy of the view which we have criticised. Father Conway has taken up a difficult and

dangerous subject, and his zeal no man may misunderstand. Whilst the difficulty should not deter us from sifting to the very bottom the question, which for its proper adjustment requires the considering of times and places, of facts as well as theories, yet the danger of sowing erroneous principles into the hearts of the simple must make us exceedingly cautious of untried utterance. It is dangerous to put a child's intelligence at fault, because that intelligence will in these times become the principal touchstone of its faith; authority yields up the two main beams of its support if it sins against logic and prudence. We leave it to the judgment of soundly educated theologians whether or not this catechism of our children's rights needs tempering in its expressions, and perhaps correction.

THE CATHOLIC YOUNG MAN OF THE PRESENT DAY. Letters to to a Young Man by Rt. Rev. Augustine Egger, D.D.—Translated from the German by Miss Ella McMahon. New York, Cincinn., Chicago: Benziger Bros., 1890.

Nothing but what is in praise can be said of this little volume, which is a good translation of a good and always timely subject, neatly put into bookform.

THE ROMAN HYMNAL, A complete manual of English Hymns and Latin Chants for the use of Congregations, Schools, Colleges, and Choirs. Compiled and arranged by Rev. J. B. Young, S.J.—Sixth Edition. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

A book of which five editions have been exhausted in as many years (the first edition of 5000 copies sold, we are told, in six months), may be considered as beyond the criticism of a reviewer, when we remember that it has constantly been in the hands of teachers and competent judges, who would detect the slightest fault and require its correction. But we wish again to recommend this book, especially to the clergy and ecclesiastics generally, because it will be a great help to them in bringing about those reforms in Church music which we all aim at more or less definitely. It is also an excellent book to put into the hands of members of the choir and of sodalities. It contains within reasonable compass the most necessary devotions suitable for every Christian, also a month's meditations, and the Little Offices of the Immaculate Conception and the Holy Guardian Angels. Besides the English and Latin Hymns with modern notation for the treble, we find the Responses for High Mass, the Asperges, Absolution of the Dead,

etc., several Masses, including such for Requiem; Vespers for the common and proper feasts; in fact, everything that those who take part in the liturgical service commonly need. The book is not bulky, as one would be led to suspect from the matter which it contains. The print is very good, as is the rule with the Pustet publications.

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL UNION, Youngstown, Ohio.

THE POPULAR CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF SELF-CULTURE.

We hope to speak again of this excellent union, which among other things offers a representative and graded list of select literature, which will greatly help the student who has no capable teacher to guide him in his reading.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The mention of books under this head does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers.

THEOLOGIA DOGMATICA CATHOLICA SPECIALIS CONCINNATA A DR. JOANNE KATSCHTHALER, Theol. in Univers. Oenip. Prof. em. Liber IV.: De Regni Divini Consummatione seu Eschatologia.—Ratisbonæ, Inst. Librar. pridem. G. J. Manz. 1888.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA. Official Announcements for the scholastic year 1890–91. Philad. Hardy and Mahony.

A RETROSPECT on events which made possible the late Baltimore Convention, and a Complement to the same. By Rev. E. A. M. of the Diocese of Vincennes, Ind.—New York: D. P. Murphy, Jr. 1890.

LEBEN DER ALLERSELIGSTEN JUNGFRAU UND GOTTESMUTTER MARIA. Auszug aus der "Geistlichen Stadt Gottes," von Maria von Jesus. Herausgegeben von P. Franz. Vogl, C.SS.R. 1890. Regensburg, New York, u. Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet.

PRINCIPLES OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND BIOLOGY, by Rev. Thomas Hughes, S.J. Second Edit. N. Y.: Benziger Bros. 1890. pp. 178.

NICOLAI NILLES E SOC. JESU COMMENTARIA IN CONCILIUM PLENARIUM BALTIMORENSE TERTIUM ex Prælectionibus academicis excerpta. Pars I.: Acta Concilii. Pars II.: Decreta Concilii. Editio domestica, privatis auditorum usibus accommodata—Oeniponte. Ex Offic. F. Ranch (C. Pustet). 1888–1890.

FR. PUSTET & CO., Sole Agents for the Renowned Art Stained Glass Institute,

INNSBRUCK & VIENNA, AUSTRIA,

Upon which His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. recently conferred the Honary Title:

APOST. ISTITUTO PREMIATO DALLA SANTA SEDE.

Window presented to His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII., on his Golden Jubilee.

☞ *In order to obtain an exact estimate it is only requisite to send a rough sketch of the window, giving the size of each opening.*

DESIGNS AND ESTIMATES SENT FREE ON APPLICATION.

Missae et Officium Defunctorum.

Missae pro Defunctis ad commodiorem ecclesiarum usum ex Missali Romano desumptae. Accedit Ritus Absolutionis pro Defunctis ex Rituali et Pontificali Romano. Editio prima post typicam S. R. C. (1889.) In small folio (10x14).

oth, - - -	1 50
Roan, red edges,	2 00
" gilt "	2 50
Morocco, gilt edges,	3 50

In this very beautiful and convenient edition, the *Ritus Absolutionis*, as well as that of Burial, is given in full, thus obviating the necessity of the *Rituale* and *Missale* for such ceremonies. The *Oratio super tumulum defuncti*, the *Ritus Absolutionis ab Episcopo vel Prælato faciendæ* according to the *Pontificale*, as also the *Commemoratio solemnis* for all religious Orders and Congregations, are found in their proper place.

Officium Defunctorum una cum Missa et Absolutione pro defunctis. Depromptum ex Rituali et Graduali Romano, quæ curavit S. Rit. Congr. (1885.) In large folio. (12"x17".) Red and black.

Half roan, cloth sides, - - - - -	3 00
Roan, gilt edges,- - - - - -	5 00

This is a reprint from the large *Antiphonarium*, and especially suitable for choirs.

Officium Defunctorum et Ordo Exsequiarum pro adultis et parvulis una cum Missa et Absolutione Defunctorum. (Cum Cantu.) Ex editionibus typicis Ritualis, Missalis, Gradualis, Breviarii et Pontificalis Romani depromptum. Editio novissima. (1887.) In 12mo. Red and black type. Cloth, - - - 75

This book has been compiled for the use of the Rev. Clergy, for teachers, directors of choirs, and singers. Whatever in the *Graduale*, *Breviary*, and *Rituale* relates to the *Exsequiarum*, has been practically collected in this volume.

Officium et Missa Defunctorum atque Ordo exsequiarum pro adultis et parvulis. *People's edition*, transposed into *modern* notation from the edition of the Rituale and Graduale Romanum supervised by the S. R. C. (1885.) In 18mo. Black type. Cloth, - 20

Subscriptions are now received for the 23d volume of

ACTA SANCTAE SEDIS

In Compendium Opportune Redacta et Illustrata. Latinæ Ephemerides. Subscription, $3.00 per volume.

FR. PUSTET & CO.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Short Sermons on the Gospels for every Sunday in the Year,

BY

REV. N. M. REDMOND.

12mo. 222 pp., cloth ..... Net, $1 00

PLAIN SERMONS

On the Fundamental Truths of The Catholic Church,

BY THE

REV. R. D. BROWNE.

Cloth ..... Net, $1 60

SERMONS, 1877–1887,

BY THE

REV. ARTHUR RYAN, President of St. Patrick's College, Thurles.

Cloth ..... Net, $2 00

SACERDOTAL MEDITATIONS,

BY

REV. FATHER CHAIGNON,

Translated from the French, from the Eleventh Edition.

2 vols., cloth ..... Net, $5 00

THE LIFE OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS,

THE ANGELIC DOCTOR

Edited by FATHER PIUS CAVANNAGH, O. P.

ILLUSTRATED.

Cloth ..... Net, $1 20

SHORT MEDITATIONS,

TO AID PIOUS SOULS IN THE RECITATION OF THE HOLY ROSARY.

Translated from the French by a member of the Order of St. Dominic. 24mo., 338 pp. Cloth, ... 50

THE DEVOTION OF THE HOLY ROSARY,

AND

THE FIVE SCAPULARS,

BY

REV. M. MULLER, C.SS.R.

12mo., 334 pp. Cloth $1 25

THE MYSTICAL ROSE,

The fifteen mysteries of the Holy Rosary. Fifteen beautiful pictures in chromo-xylography, after the celebrated Prof. Fuehrich. With text.

24mo. Red cloth, gilt edges ..... Net, $1 00

FR. PUSTET & CO.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

RITUS SOLEMNIS

PRO

DEDICATIONE ECCLESIAE

et consecratione sive unius sive plurium altarium tam fixorum quam portalium *juxta editionem typicam Pontificalis Romani* ad majorem episcoporum commoditatem concinnatus. Cum Cantu Sacr. Rit. Congr. Folio, red morocco, gilt edges, $12 00.

NICOLAI NILLES, S. J.,

COMMENTARIA IN

Concilium Plenarium Baltimorense Tertium,

EX PRAELECTIONIBUS ACADEMICIS AD USUS

AUDITORUM PERMISSU PRAESIDUM EDITA.

Octavo. Half morocco, $4.00

JOSEPH FESSLER,

QUONDAM EPISCOPI S. HYPPOLYTI

INSTITUTIONES PATROLOGIÆ

QUAS DENUO RECENSUIT, AUXIT, EDIDIT

BERNARDUS JUNGMANN.

Tom. I., octavo, half morocco, $2.25.

FR. PUSTET & CO.

WORKS BY THE LATE CARDINAL NEWMAN.

NEW AND CHEAPER ISSUES. 12mo, cloth.

Apologia pro Vita Sua. [Ready.]	$1 25
Callista, a Tale of the Third Century. [Ready.]	1 25
Verses on Various Occasions. [Ready.]	1 25
An Essay on the Development of the Christian Doctrine. [Ready.]	1 25
Essays, Critical and Historical, 2 vols. [Very Shortly.]	2 50
The Arians of the Fourth Century. [Very Shortly.]	1 25
Essays on Biblical and on Ecclesiastical Miracles. [Very Shortly.]	1 25

Library Edition, Uniformly printed, Crown 8vo.

The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated	$2 50
Historical Sketches. 3 vols. Each,	2 00
Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects.	2 00
An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine	2 00
Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered. Vol. I.,	2 50
Vol. II.,	2 00
The Via Media of the Anglican Church. Illustrated in Lectures, etc., 2 vols. Each,	2 00
Essays, Critical and Historical. 2 vols.	4 00
Essays on Biblical and on Ecclesiastical Miracles.	2 00
An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent.	2 50
The Arians of the Fourth Century.	2 00
Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians. 2 vols.	5 00
Verses on Various Occasions.	2 00
The Dream of Gerontius. 16mo. Sewed, .20; Cloth,	35
Callista, a Tale of the Third Century.	2 00
The Present Position of Catholics in England. Sixth Edition.	2 50
Parochial and Plain Sermons. New Editions. 8 vols. Sold Separately. Each.	1 75
Fifteen Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford, between A. D. 1826 and 1843. New Edition.	1 75
Sermons Bearing upon Subjects of the Day. New Edition.	1 75
Selection Adapted to the Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year, from the "Parochial and Plain Sermons."	1 75

Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification. Fourth Edition. 1 75

WHEN WE WERE BOYS.

A NOVEL. BY WILLIAM O'BRIEN, M. P.

Crown 8vo., cloth, 556 pages. - - - - ***$1.50***

*** The volume contains the following letter from Mr. O'Brien, reproduced in fac-simile:

I desire respectfully to acquaint the American public that Messrs. Longmans, Green, & Co. are the only authorized publishers of this novel in America, and that editions issued by them are the only ones from which I derive any profits.

DUBLIN, April 12th, 1890. WILLIAM O'BRIEN.

THE PILOT, Boston:
"We have not touched on its artistic merits, notable as they are, and first contradiction of the charge that the latter phases of the Irish struggle are barren in literature. The book has a vastly more important aspect, and must be a potent force in furthering the work for which its author has worked and suffered beyond the wont of even his countrymen."

CATHOLIC STANDARD, Philadelphia:
"Contains unusually numerous elements of strength. Every character in it is so powerfully drawn, and every incident so graphically described, that not only is the reader's interest not abated once he takes up the book, but grows deeper as he proceeds. This is the more remarkable considering the extraordinarily wide scope that the story covers; for every manner of happening and every condition of person and life in Ireland is introduced. Yet the unity of the story is never once broken."

CATHOLIC NEWS, New York:
"The book will be read by thousands, and do more than speeches in Parliament, or public meetings, or labored essays in reviews and magazines, to bring Ireland's real position home to the hearts of sympathetic men who love liberty."

For sale by all booksellers, or sent on receipt of price by the publishers

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 15 East 16th Street, New York.